DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 298 048 SO 019 253

AUTHOR Rutkowski, Edward, Ed.
TITLE Papers and Proceedings of the Annual Meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society (19th, Chicago, Illinois, October 28-29, 1983).
INSTITUTION Midwest History of Education Society, Cedar Falls, IA.
PUB DATE 84
NOTE 204p.; For related documents, see SO 019 242-257.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021) -- Collected Works - Serials (022)
JOURNAL CIT Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society; v12 1984

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC09 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Blacks; College Administration; *Early Childhood Education; *Educational History; Educational Theories; Experimental Schools; Federal Aid; Females; *Higher Education; Labor Education; Oral History; Progressive Education; *Racial Bias; Research Methodology; Sex Bias; Teachers
IDENTIFIERS Critical Evaluation; *Dewey (John); *Froebel (Friedrich)

ABSTRACT

The papers of this proceedings are grouped in five parts. The three papers in part 1 discuss the exposure of Italian scholars to Dewey's philosophies and include the titles (1) "John Dewey in the Evolution of Italian Education" (C. R. Wolf); (2) "Frederick Eby and the Dewey Lectures: An Essentialist Present at Educational Progressivism's Conception" (B. Westfall); and (3) "The Dewey School: A Record of Success and a Reality of Failure" (C. Eisele). Part 2, "Shaping Educational Policy: Models from the Past", discusses the discrimination against women teachers, the education of wage earners with federal funds, the life adjustment education movement, and the purposes of the International Consortium of Options in Public Education and the Progressive Education Association. The titles are: (1) "The Women Peril: As a Barrier to the Rise of Women Teachers, 1890-1920" (P. Carter); (2) "Education as a Form of Emergency Relief: The New Deal Experience" (J. Sealander); (3) "Beyond the Prosser Revolution: Another Look at Life Adjustment Education" (R. Ognibene); and (4) "The Twilight of Public Alternative Education: Professional Malignancy, An Historical Perspective" (J. T. Sears and J. D. Marshall). Part 3, "A Past Perspective on Childhood Theory and Practice," presents the introduction of Froebelian kindergarten into Ontario (Canada) and the inception of farm schools in England. The titles are: "Ontario's Kindergarten-Primary Movement: Utilitarianism Subverts Idealism" (B. A. Wood) and "The Farm-School System of 19th Century Europe and Its Legacy" (T. J. Phillips). The two papers in part 4, "Issues In Historical Research", cover the need for educators to be familiar with the history of education, and are titled "Historical Research for Educational Questions" (J. M. Lakebrink) and "Oral History: Use of Interviews to Obtain a Historical Perspective of Early Childhood Education" (S. Boyd). Part 5, "Some Perspectives on Higher Education" includes four papers discussing the evolution of modern higher education. The titles include: "The Americanization of Higher Learning" (E. Feldman); "Life and Death of an Agricultural College" (W. Eaton and M. Bond); "From Principal Teacher to Corporate Manager: An Institutional History of Change in the Role of the College President" (R. N. Barger); and "Privileged Turf: Black Participation at the University of Cincinnati, 1955-1976: The Langsam and Bennis Years" (L. L. Jones). The program, the business meeting's minutes, and the directory of attendance are included. (DJC)

ED298048

Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society

Volume 12, 1984

Papers and proceedings of the 19th meeting

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

EDWARD RUTKOWSKI

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Published by the
Department of Educational Psychology
and Foundations
College of Education,
University of Northern Iowa

SO 019 253

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Distributed and Published for the Society by the
Department of Educational Psychology and Foundations
College of Education — University of Northern Iowa

Cedar Falls, Iowa

Copyright 1984 by the Midwest History
of Education Society
Edited by
Edward Rutkowski

Any subscriptions or inquiries should be sent to:

Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society
Education Center, Room 513
University of Northern Iowa
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society

Volume 12, 1984

Papers and proceedings of the 19th meeting

Published by the
Department of Educational Psychology
and Foundations
College of Education,
University of Northern Iowa

Ontario's Kindergarten-Primary Movement: Utilitarianism Subverts Idealism.
Anne Wood,
Dalhousie University 94

The Farm School System of 19th Century Europe and Its Legacy.
Trevor J. Phillips,
Bowling Green State University 108

PART IV
ISSUES IN HISTORICAL RESEARCH

Historical Research for Education Questions.
Joan M. Lakebrink,
DePaul University 120

Oral History: Use of Interviews for a Historical Perspective of Early Childhood Education.
Sherry L. Boyd,
University of Dubuque 129

PART V
SOME PERSPECTIVES ON HIGHER EDUCATION

The Americanization of Higher Learning.
Egal Feldman,
University of Wisconsin, Superior 139

The Life and Death of an Agricultural College.
William Eaton,
Southern Illinois University 146

From Principal Teacher to Corporate Manager: An Institutional Case History of Change in the Role of the College President.
Robert N. Barger,
Eastern Illinois University 154

Privileged Turf: Black Participation at the University of Cincinnati: 1955-1976 — The Langsam and Bennis Years.
Lewis L. Jones,
University of Cincinnati 169

PART VI
PROGRAM AND PROCEEDINGS

OFFICIAL PROGRAM 190

MINUTES OF THE BUSINESS MEETING 193

DIRECTORY OF ATTENDANCE 195

CONTENTS

PART I
JOHN DEWEY REVISED AND REVISITED

John Dewey in the Evolution of Italian Education.
Charles R. Wolf,
Spencer Foundation, Chicago 1

Frederick Eby and the Dewey Lectures: An Essentialist Present at Educational Progressivism's Conception.
Barry Westfall,
Baylor University 12

The Dewey School: A Record of Success and a Reality of Failure.
Christopher Eisele,
Illinois State University 29

PART II
SHAPING EDUCATIONAL POLICY: MODELS FROM THE PAST

The Women Peril: As a Barrier to the Rise of Women Schoolteachers: 1890-1910.
Patricia Carter,
University of Cincinnati 41

Education as a Form of Emergency Relief: The New Deal Experience.
Judith Sealander,
Wright State University 55

Beyond the Prosser Resolution: Another Look at Life Adjustment Education.
Richard Ognibene,
The College of Saint Rose, Albany 66

The Twilight of Public Alternative Education: Professional Malignancy, an Historical Perspective
James T. Sears,
Trinity University 80

PART III
A PAST PERSPECTIVE ON CHILDHOOD THEORY AND PRACTICE

PART I
John Dewey Revised and Revisited

JOHN DEWEY IN THE EVOLUTION OF ITALIAN EDUCATION

by

CHARLES R. WOLF

Spencer Foundation, Chicago

Introduction

Interesting and useful perspectives can be gained by studying the ways in which theories of education proliferate, spread across national boundaries, and are adjusted to new intellectual climates. The process is not restricted to education, of course; as it also occurs among philosophies, ideologies, and religions, its contemplation could lead to fruitful cross-disciplinary study.

Given the worldwide prestige of Dewey as an educator during the first half of this century, it should not be surprising to American scholars to find Deweyan or quasi-Deweyan movements in many parts of the world. Indeed, there was an international movement in "new education" (as evidenced by the New Education Fellowship, or N.E.F.) to which Deweyanism was the main American contribution. Unfortunately, the movement's history is not centrally documented with regard to the countries which it touched; and the unsettling world events of the 1930's and 1940's surely hindered systematic, scholarly recording on the part of the new educators.

The spread of Deweyanism may be documented in individual countries, and the example in this paper, to date relatively unexplored, is Italy. The Italians' familiarity with Dewey can be documented as early as 1910, and it increased as translations and other publications appeared before World War II. After the war, the number of translations grew rapidly, accompanied by the coalescence of a group of Italian scholars devoted to interpreting Dewey's philosophy and educational thought.

Dewey's Interest in Italy

Curiously, Dewey himself seems to have had little to do with Italy. In Dykhuizen's biography of Dewey, only a few references to that country appear. According to that source, Dewey and his family spent some time in Italy in 1894 and 1895; early in 1895, Dewey's son, Morris, aged two and a half, contracted diphtheria and died in Milan.[1] The Deweys went to Europe again in 1904, and this time their eight-year-old son Gordon contracted typhoid and died in Ireland. In Italy shortly thereafter, the Deweys adopted an Italian boy named Sabino who was about the same age as Gordon.[2] There are no mentions of scholarly contacts made by Dewey on those trips to Italy, and in view of the tragic family events overshadowing those journeys, it would not be surprising if Dewey had

restricted his attention to family matters. In later years, Dewey traveled widely, visiting China and Japan, the U.S.S.R., Turkey, and Mexico, but there is no evidence of further travel in Italy. Perhaps a diligent search of archival material would reveal scholarly contacts with the Italians, but neither Dykhuizen nor Dewey's daughter, Jane, sees fit to discuss any "Italian connection" of John Dewey in the scholarly world.

The Italian Interest in Dewey

Despite his apparent neglect of Italian matters, Dewey was by no means unknown to the Italians. His reputation as a philosopher and educator extended around the world, and his books came to be translated into many languages and commented upon by scholars of many traditions, even in lands where very different cultural situations existed.

During the period of Fascist power (roughly, between 1922 and 1944), Italian intellectual life was dominated by the philosophy of "actual idealism." It was derived from Hegel, and depends upon a particular interpretation of that German philosopher. Essentially, it teaches that all phenomena are mental, having their true reality in thought; thought is identified as action and action as thought; thought expresses itself in culture, which is a collective form of thought and action, transcending the individual. Eventually, actual idealism's emphasis on collectivity leads to the identification of the interests of the individual with those of the state and its leaders.[3] It is obvious why such a philosophy received Fascist approval. Actual idealism's principal theoretician, Giovanni Gentile (1875-1944), was Mussolini's first minister of education, from 1922 to 1924. Through the 1920's and 1930's, it was government policy to place either loyal Fascists or actual idealists in key positions in the state-controlled schools and universities. At the same time, dissident elements were removed whenever and wherever it was possible; the more outspoken dissidents were often imprisoned.[4] Under the circumstances, it was hardly possible for a strong school of democratic philosophy to develop in Italy before the Second World War. Nevertheless, the eclectic interests of certain Italian scholars provided opportunities for Deweyan ideas to reach the intelligentsia even in the bizarre atmosphere of the era between the world wars.

The first Italian translation of Dewey was of excerpts from *School and Society*. They appeared in an article on Dewey written in 1910 by Giuseppe Lombardo-Radice (1879-1938), a philosopher and educator of the Hegelian idealist school.[5] Although Lombardo-Radice long retained an interest in Dewey's instructional theories, he rejected the American scholar's philosophical formulations and tried to reinterpret Dewey's work to harmonize with the tenets of actual idealism. In 1913, a translation of *My Pedagogic Creed* was published in Rome by Luigi Oliva. A complete translation of *School and Society* appeared in 1915, and was the work of Giuseppina Di Laghi, who was a student of Lombardo-Radice.[6] In 1930, Italian interest in Dewey was stimulated from another quarter when Giovanni Vidari (1871-1934), a Christian spiritualist philosopher,

went to the United States to deliver a series of lectures at the University of California at Berkeley. While there, Vidari developed an interest in Dewey's theories, which he later introduced to his own students in Italy.[7] Guido De Ruggiero (1888-1948), a noted liberal historian, philosopher, and educator, translated *Reconstruction in Philosophy* and published it in 1931. De Ruggiero prefaced the book with an introduction which was also published as an article in *Critica*, a journal edited by Benedetto Croce.[8]

The first major Italian critical study of Dewey's work appeared in 1939. This was *Il pensiero di Giovanni Dewey (The Thought of John Dewey)* by Maria Teresa Gillio-Tos, published by Loffredo of Naples. Gillio-Tos was a member of a religious order and a student of Bernardino Varisco (1850-1933), an idealist philosopher with religious leanings. The study was an effort to analyze all of Dewey's works from his first article of 1886 to *A Common Faith* of 1934. Although her research was thorough and scholarly, Gillio-Tos missed no opportunity to criticize Dewey from a religious and absolutistic standpoint.

To an extent, the work of Dewey was made known in Italy by the New Education Fellowship, at least until Italian educators were forbidden by the Mussolini government to have any contact with that organization. The New Education Fellowship, or N.E.F., was founded in 1921 and included various European and American educators of experimental, "progressive," or "activist" tendencies. Thus the "new education" movement which that body represented was not purely Deweyan, but many of its members were sympathetic to Dewey's efforts. Lombardo-Radice took an interest in the organization, and so did his noteworthy student, Ernesto Codignola (1885-1965). Codignola, like his teacher, was a Hegelian idealist, but he also had a profound interest in unorthodox approaches to education. Although Lombaro-Radice died in 1938, Codignola lived until 1965 and was instrumental in publicizing both the N.E.F. and Deweyan ideas in Italy after World War II.

The Postwar Growth of Deweyanism in Italy

Ernesto Codignola, like his mentor, was a lifelong idealist. Codignola admired Dewey's teaching methods, yet he deplored the naturalistic philosophical bases of pragmatism. Under the influence of his teachers, he had participated in various Fascist education projects in the 1920's and 1930's. Although he began to become disenchanted with the regime in the late 1930's, he remained at his teaching post at the University of Florence and avoided political persecution until 1944, when he was vaguely implicated in the plot to murder Gentile. The confusion of war and the imminent arrival of the Allied forces spared him from any serious difficulties.

An astute man, Codignola knew what educational ideas the occupation forces would bring, and he set about the task of preparing Italian educators to understand the Deweyan point of view. In 1946, Codignola

published two books that helped to prepare the intellectual ground for the new education: *Le "scuole nuove" e i loro problemi (The "New Schools" and Their Problems)*, and *Educazione liberatrice (Education the Liberator)*. The first book, *Le "scuole nuove e i loro problemi*, catalogues the contributions of reformist educators from Pestalozzi through Dewey and Kilpatrick. *Educazione liberatrice* is a carefully-edited collection of Codignola's essays generally supporting reformist and democratic approaches to education; notably, it praises the concept of learning through problem solving.

In the 1930's, Codignola had established a publishing company called La Nuova Italia Editrice, in Florence. He retained control of the company during and after World War II, and soon after the war its presses came into use for printing his own and others' translations of Deweyan material. With Lamberto Borghi (of whom more will be said), Codignola translated and published *School and Society* in 1949. Codignola's translation of *Experience and Education* also appeared in that year. Borghi and Codignola translated material by Washburne and published *Le scuole di Vinnetka (Winnetka's Schools)* in 1952. The translation and publication of Dewey's works and related material continued well into the mid-1950's, and the majority of those publications were printed on the presses of La Nuova Italia. Codignola also founded a journal, *Scuola e cittá (School and City)*, whose editorial staff included a number of Italian scholars familiar with Dewey; it served well to introduce the Deweyan approach to Italian educators.

By 1945, Codignola had established contacts with Carleton Washburne and with the Swiss educator Adolphe Ferriére (1879-1960), both of whom were officers of the New Education Fellowship. Although the N.E.F. had been banned in Italy during the Fascist years, Codignola hastened to join it in 1945, and through it he established contacts with J.A. Lauwerys, Clare Soper, A.S. Neill, and other progressive and experimentalist educators of that period.[9] Soper provided Codignola with N.E.F. documents which he translated and later published through La Nuova Italia. Codignola and Washburne engineered the formation of a(n) N.E.F. branch in Italy in 1947; it was the Florentine section of the N.E.F., led by Codignola and his wife Anna Maria. Subsequently, an all-Italian section was formed in 1949, and Codignola naturally became its first president.

Another important postwar activity of Ernesto Codignola was the establishment of the Scuola-Cittá Pestalozzi (Pestalozzi School-City) in Florence. Although the pedagogical ideas that guided Scuola-Cittá Pestalozzi were Codignola's, derived from his idealism (after the war, an idealism closer to historicism), the practices of the school were subtly influenced by Codignola's reading of Dewey. Washburne visited the school and was favorably impressed. In later years, the school was directed by Florentine professors who were more philosophically and ideologically committed to Dewey than was Codignola.

In the minds of many American historians of education, no American name is more closely linked to Italian education than that of Carleton Wolsey Washburne (1889-1968). By his own account, Washburne learned of progressive educational methods from his mother, Marion Guyon (Foster) Washburne, who had become an acquaintance of Francis Parker and John Dewey through her work in editing educational journals.[10] Undoubtedly, Washburne is best known for his activities as superintendent of schools in Winnetka, Illinois, from 1919 to 1943.

In 1943, Washburne underwent military training and accepted a commission as a major in the United States Army Reserve. He was assigned to assist the Allied military government in Italy in the task of reconstructing public schooling in liberated areas. "My job," Washburne writes, "was to reopen schools and universities and rid them of fascism and Fascists."[11]

When the Allied commission replaced the Allied military government, Washburne (now a lieutenant colonel) acted as minister of education for recently-liberated parts of Italy, eventually turning the responsibility over to civilian authorities. In his second year in Italy, Washburne worked closely with the Italian minister of public instruction, Professor Guido De Ruggiero. De Ruggiero, a scholar of liberal political tendencies, had been arrested by the Fascists in 1943, but he became rector of the University of Rome after the fall of Mussolini. From that position, he was called to serve as minister of public instruction in the government of Prime Minister Bonomi from June to December of 1944. De Ruggiero may not have considered himself a Deweyan, but he was sufficiently interested in philosophical movements to have translated Dewey's *Reconstruction in Philosophy* in 1931. Washburne records that a personal friendship developed between himself and De Ruggiero.

Washburne was separated from the U.S. Army in 1946 and accepted an assignment from the U.S. State Department to serve as director of the United States Information Service office in Milan. He remained in Milan for two years, during which time his association with Codignola developed and his N.E.F. activities resumed.[12] Although intervening in Italian education was not part of Washburne's duties as U.S.I.S. director, he could not forego that activity. At one point, he arranged for ten Italian teachers to go to Switzerland to study with Jean Piaget.[13] For his efforts in Italy, Washburne received two high honors: the Grande Bene Merito, awarded by the University of Rome in 1945, and the title of Knight Officer, Order of the Crown of Italy, awarded in 1946. Obviously, Italian educators of Deweyan inclinations had a strong ally in Carleton Washburne; but Washburne was certainly not the only individual responsible for introducing Deweyanism to Italy.

Another scholar who had much to do with the dissemination of Deweyan philosophical and educational thought in postwar Italy was Codignola's close associate, Lamberto Borghi (b. 1907). Borghi, who graduated from the University of Pisa in 1929, had taught history and

philosophy in Italian high schools until the racial decrees of 1938 deprived him of his employment. Like many others of the Jewish faith, Borghi found it prudent to flee the anti-Semitic hysteria of Axis Europe. He left Italy in May of 1940 and traveled to New York.[14]

Borghi spent the next four years teaching and studying in America, first at the "University in Exile" of the New School of Social Research, and then at Yale University, Harvard University, and Cornell University. In 1945, supported by research fellowships, he began work on a historical study called *Educazione e autoritá nell'Italia moderna (Education and Authority in Modern Italy)*, a work that was to become his doctoral thesis. Borghi enrolled in the New School for Social Research in 1946, and there he studied with Horace Meyer Kallen and Felix Kaufmann. At the end of his studies, Borghi was awarded the degree of Doctor of Social Science, and he returned to Italy in mid-1947.[15]

Soon after his return, Borghi began his scholarly association with Ernesto Codignola. The first product of their work was a translation of *School and Society*, published in 1949. Borghi translated Dewey's *Education Today* and published it in 1950. In 1954, Borghi, Codignola, and Enzo Agnoletti published a translation of *My Pedagogic Creed*, which appeared as part of a book of essays on Deweyan education. In addition, Borghi produced Italian translations of Horace M. Kallen's *The Education of Free Men* and William Heard Kilpatrick's *Philosophy of Education*, and he wrote an introduction to Aldo Visalberghi's 1958 translation of Dewey's *Human Nature and Conduct*.

Borghi's scholarly activities were not limited to the translation of Deweyan texts in education. His dissertation research in the U.S.A. led to the publication of *Educazione e autoritá nell'Italia moderna* in 1951. The book is primarily a historical study of Italian education from the *Risorgimento* period up to the time of World War II and the resistance. The underlying motif of Borghi's chapters is that of the struggle for control of education in Italy, a struggle involving the various political factions and the Catholic church. It emphasizes the contributions of liberal and progressive forces contending against the politics and pedagogy of reaction; thus the ideological bias in the book is clearly discernible.

Other scholarly contributions by Borghi in the 1950's range from *John Dewey e il pensiero pedagogico contemporaneo negli Stati Uniti d'America (John Dewey and Contemporary Pedagogical Thought in the United States of America)*, published in 1952, to "La categoria della socialitá nel pensiero pedagogico di John Dewey" ("The Category of Sociality in the Pedagogical Thought of John Dewey"), in an anthology called *Il pensiero americano contemporaneo (Contemporary American Thought)*, published in 1958.

Certain emphases are discernible in Borghi's treatment of Dewey: for

example, he is eager to demonstrate the moral aspects of pragmatism, presumably to answer the Catholic and remaining idealist scholars who insisted that Dewey's philosophy provided insufficient grounds for establishing moral theory. Borghi goes beyond morality to announce a "religious" aspect of Dewey's work, defining religion in an idiosyncratic way, yet without any serious deviations from Dewey's texts. Although such adaptations are discernible in Borghi, the centrality of Deweyan thought in Borghi's work is always evident.

The efforts of Codignola and Borghi in translating and publicizing Dewey might have received less attention in Italy if the two scholars had not been at the center of a school of Dewey-inspired thought — the so-called "Scuola di Firenze" or "School of Florence." Codignola retained his professorship at the University of Florence until 1955, when he retired. Then Borghi, who had taught in Pisa, Palermo, and Turin, was invited to Florence to take the same chair of pedagogy that Codignola was vacating. Borghi remained in Florence for the remainder of his years of active teaching; and as of late 1982, he was still living in Florence.

Expansion of the School of Florence

Some promising younger scholars were attracted to the School of Florence in the 1940's and 1950's, and each developed unique syntheses and interpretations. A glance at several of the more prominent Florentine Deweyans will conclude this paper.

Raffaele Laporta (b. 1916) was educated at the University of Rome, where one of his teachers was Giuseppe Lombardo-Radice, the idealist philosopher. Laporta completed a degree in jurisprudence in 1937, but his growing interest in education led him away from a career in law. In 1939, he was hired to teach philosophy, history, and pedagogy in the state upper secondary schools, and began a lengthy period of teaching.

In 1958, Laporta was invited to Florence to become director of the Scuola-Città Pestalozzi, which Ernesto Codignola had founded and from whose directorship Codignola was retiring. In 1960, he accepted a concurrent appointment as professor of pedagogy in the Faculty of Letters and Philosophy of the University of Florence. He remained in Florence until 1965, then moved to a post at the University of Cagliari, in Sardinia; in 1969, he accepted a chair in pedagogy at the University of Rome.

Laporta's publications date from the 1950's, but his first important theoretical work in education appeared in 1960. That was *Educazione e libertà in una società in progresso (Education and Freedom in a Society in Progress)*, a book addressing the problem of freedom in human society. Essentially, he sees freedom as the spontaneity of the individual in the quest for equilibrium and expansion in the social context. That freedom, he insists, is not absolute, but is regulated by relations with one's peers "in the organic framework of nature."[16] Laporta refers his

readers to Dewey's *Democracy and Education* for the outlines of a desirable society. The second section of *Educazione e libertá* is a discussion of the optimal balance between freedoms and restraints. In an effort to be objective, he devises a formula for the functionality of society. In the briefer closing chapters, Laporta explores the actual and possible work of education in detail, expanding on some of his earlier themes.

Throughout the 1960's and 1970's, Laporta continued to write and publish on themes as varied as the unified school, community in the school, education through films, technical education, dietology, and proposals for school reform. His writings contain frequent references to Dewey and other educators of the new education movement.

Laporta's professional activities include membership in various progressive (or "activist") educational organizations. He was one of the founders of the Movimento di Cooperazione Educativa, or M.C.E. (Educational Cooperation Movement), begun in 1955. He also served as secretary of the Italian section of the N.E.F. from 1955 to 1962. Since 1960, Laporta has been on the editorial board of the Florentine education journal, *Scuola e cittá*. He is considered one of the more classic and orthodox of the Italian interpreters of Dewey.[17]

Francesco De Bartolomeis (b. 1918), has been called the "last and best" of Ernesto Codignola's students.[18] De Bartolomeis was educated at the University of Florence. He also taught there, and then transferred to the University of Turin, where since 1956 he has been a professor of pedagogy and director of the university's Institute of Pedagogy.

Much of De Bartolomeis' scholarly attention has been focused on the problem of linking a scientific pedagogy to classroom instructional practice. That was the concern of his first book: *La pedagogia come scienza (Pedagogy as Science)*, published in 1953. Therein he states his intention to ". . . remove educational theory from a priorisms of various hues and origins. . . ."[19] He advocates a scientific mentality that can be addressed to a broad range of concerns. No philosophy of education, he announces, may consider itself independent of or superior to the pedagogical sciences, which he defines as psychology, sociology, and experimental pedagogy. The chief use of philosophical inquiry is in defining values for the educator, De Bartolomeis contends. For efficacy in linking science to instructional activity, he recommends the "new education," which embodies the scientific approach of the activist or Deweyan educator. Much of *La pedagogia come scienza* is devoted to examining the origins of the new education, comparing traditional versus active models of schooling, and discussing the function of education in the social context.

In 1958, De Bartolomeis published *Cos'é la scuola attiva (What the Active School Is)*, a book that is heavily based on child development theory and Maslow's theory of needs. In this book, De Bartolomeis assigns Dewey to the category of "revolutionary" rather than "refor-

mist" educators, stressing the social implications of Dewey's pedagogy. *Lezioni di pedagogia (Readings in Pedagogy)*, published in 1962, is an investigation of the role of education in the social and political context. De Bartolomeis attacks the "illusory" democracy of Italy that allows obsolete and dysfunctional schooling to continue, and he discusses the implications of possible educational reforms. Stronger criticisms of the educational establishment appear in *La ricerca come antipedagogia (Research as Antipedagogy)*, 1969, where De Bartolomeis stresses the importance of scientific thinking in overcoming apathy and dogmatism.

By the early 1970's, De Bartolomeis was urging educators to undertake a (political) struggle for social and cultural renewal. He has come to be regarded a leading spokesman for the left wing of the School of Florence.[20]

Aldo Visalberghi (b. 1919) has taught at the universities of Milan, Turin, and Rome. Although he did not study or teach in Florence, he has cooperated with the Florentine scholars in the matter of editing and preparing publications, including the editing of a series of scholarly monographs published by La Nuova Italia. He is also on the editorial board of the journal *Scuola e città*.

Visalberghi's first major publication was a study of John Dewey, published in 1952 and called, simply, *John Dewey*. In it, Visalberghi outlines the connections between Dewey's philosophy and his pedagogy, and reflects on the nature and importance of Dewey's thought in a broad intellectual context. Visalberghi strongly defends Deweyan philosophy and inveighs against those (chiefly leftist) critics who want to "go beyond" activism, denying the depth of Dewey's democratic inspiration.[21] He also criticizes the idealist philosophers who tried to separate Dewey's pedagogy from his philosophy. In 1958, Visalberghi published *Esperienza e valutazione (Experience and Evaluation)*. Although it is primarily aimed at the problems of evaluating school learning, the book begins with a theoretical discussion in which Visalberghi discusses the concept of "transaction" which he has openly borrowed from a study by Dewey and Arthur B. Bentley, *Knowing and the Known*. Visalberghi attempts to build a theory of transactional evaluation based on an elaboration of transactional criteria which he outlines.

Visalberghi published *Scuola aperta (The Open School)*, in 1960, setting forth his vision of rejuvenated state schools open to a multiplicity of positions and different viewpoints. Such schools should have to be free from structural constrictions, premature social distinctions, and exclusiveness. Visalberghi provides a historical study of educators whom he sees as sympathetic to those reforms; they include John Dewey and Edouard Clapatede.

One of the scholars with whom Visalberghi has worked closely is Nicola Abbagnano (b. 1901), an existentialist philosopher. Although he is not principally a teacher of pedagogy, Abbagnano has certain affinities

for education.[22] One of Abbagnano's considerable services to the Deweyan cause was the publication of a brief article in *Rivista di filosofia* in 1948, called "Verso il nuovo illuminismo: John Dewey" ("Toward the New Illuminism: John Dewey"). The article compares Dewey's faith in scientific problem solving to the scientific faith of the eighteenth-century illuminists; however, Abbagnano asserts the superiority of Dewey's vision, which he calls ". . . a humane force directed at making the world more humane."[23]

There are others associated with the School of Florence who might be mentioned: Giacomo Cives (b. 1927) and Maria Corda Costa (b. 1922) of the University of Rome; Egle Becchi (b. 1930) of the University of Milan; Guido Petter and Lydia Tornatore, who are primarily psychologists; and the left wing of the movement, which includes Angelo Broccoli (b. 1933), Antonio Santoni Rugiu (b. 1921), Tina Tomasi Ventura (b. 1912), and Fortunato Brancatisano.

Conclusion

No matter what their particular interpretations, the Italian scholars who studied, expanded, and criticized Deweyan thought helped to establish it as a major feature of the Italian intellectual environment. From one era to another, there were changes in the ways in which Italians tried to understand Dewey: Gentile read him as a Hegelian, De Ruggiero read him as a liberal, and De Bartolomeis came to see Dewey as a revolutionary quite compatible with Marx. Nevertheless, the books were translated, and the interpretations and critiques were written, forming an important body of philosophical and pedagogical literature. Certainly, Deweyanism has been a presence in Italian educational thought; yet, as in the U.S.A., it has been a controversial force, finding enemies as well as supporters. Nevertheless, by the 1950's Deweyanism was sufficiently established in Italy for an Italian scholar to prophesy: "The interest in such a complex personality as that of Dewey cannot cease, nor will it cease."[24]

Notes

[1] George Dykhuizen, *The Life and Mind of John Dewey* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), p. 79.

[2] Ibid., p. 115.

[3] For a thorough exposition, see Giovanni Gentile, *Genesis and Structure of Society*, tr. H.S. Harris (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1960), passim.

[4] Among the dissidents whom the Fascists mistrusted were Marxists, certain Catholics, and a handful of old-fashioned liberals. Marxists like Antonio Gramsci were likely to go to prison, while the liberals and Catholics (the latter in view of the Concordat of 1929) were usually ignored.

[5] Francesco Cafaro, "John Dewey e il pensiero italiano," *L'Italia che scrive* 33 (July 1950):1.

[6] Graziella Federici Vescovini, "La fortuna di John Dewey in Italia," *Rivista di filosofia* 53 (January 1961):64.

[7] Cafaro, "John Dewey e il pensiero," p. 1.

[8] Ibid.

[9] Raffaele Laporta, "L'educazione nuova nel secondo dopoguerra," *Ernesto Codignola in 50 anni di battaglie educative* (Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1967), p. 161.

[10] Carleton Wolsey Washburne, "An Autobiographical Sketch," in *Leaders in American Education*, ed. Robert J. Havighurst (Chicago: The National Society for the Study of Education, 1971), p. 461.

[11] Ibid., p. 471.

[12] Washburne was president of the N.E.F. from 1947 to 1956.

[13] Washburne, "Autobiographical Sketch," p. 473.

[14] Mauro Laeng, *I contemporanei* (Florence: Giunti Barbera, 1979), p. 934.

[15] Ibid., pp. 934-935.

[16] Raffaele Laporta, *Educazione e libertà in una società in progresso* (Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1960), p. 21.

[17] Franco Cambi, *La "Scuola di Firenze"*, (Naples: Liguori Editore, 1982), p. 13.

[18] Raffaele Laporta, "L'educazione nuova nel secondo dopoguerra," in *Ernesto Codignola in 50 anni di battaglie educative* (Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1967), p. 166.

[19] Francesco De Bartolomeis, *La pedagogia come scienza* (Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1953), p. ix.

[20] Cambi, *La "Scuola di Firenze"*, p. 13.

[21] Aldo Visalberghi, *John Dewey* (Florence: La Nuova Italia Editrice, 1952; 1961), pp. vii-viii.

[22] A fine study of Abbagnano as a philosopher and educator is available in English, by Professor Gari Lesnoff-Caravaglia. It is called *Education as Existential Possibility* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1972).

[23] Nicola Abbagnano, "Verso il nuovo illuminismo: John Dewey," *Rivista di filosofia* 39 (October-December 1948):325.

[24] Iclea Picco, "Note sul Dewey in Italia," *Problemi della pedagogia* 1 (1955):514-515.

FREDERICK EBY AND THE DEWEY LECTURES: AN ESSENTIALIST PRESENT AT EDUCATIONAL PROGRESSIVISM'S CONCEPTION

Barry H. Westfall
Baylor University

Introduction

> Dr. Dewey . . . always remained an earthworm below the surface; never did he sprout wings. . . . Earthworms perform services far more commercially beneficial than butterflies; but the latter break through . . . to a world of sweetness and beauty of which the former never dreams. . . . Having shattered American education by his philosophic meanderings, the world enters the cosmic age intellectually, morally and spiritually in the plight of ants whose mound has been torn up by a blockbuster. Individuals scurry about wildly without a concerted end in view. Experiments and investigations . . . but only details, contradictions and irrelevancy have resulted. The Darwin-Dewey century has just closed in confusion, humiliation for American science and education, and . . . in moral and spiritual lethargy and ineptitude for the American soul. . . .[1]

In this typical 1959 broadside written at the peak of the "Sputnik hysteria" and on the occasion of the centennial of both John Dewey's birth and the writing of Charles Darwin's *Origin of the Species*, Frederick Eby presents his assessment of the contributions of this American philosopher. Eby's ideas and writings were no different from dozens of other assorted traditionalists who lambasted the entire Dewey phenomenon at the time. What does make Frederick Eby unique is the fact that from 1895 until 1898, he studied under Dewey at the University of Chicago — an extremely crucial time in the annals of American educational history. Frederick Eby was, therefore, literally present at the conception of the American pragmatic-progressive movement and subsequently was to spend his life as a virulent foe of Dewey's ideas.

This paper is, in effect, a continuation or the second half of an exposition which was presented in April, 1983, at the Annual Meeting of the Society for Educational Biography at Iowa State University. The first paper, entitled "Frederick Eby: Portrait of an Essentialist," extensively outlined his major contributions to and writings in the field of educational history and philosophy, as well as his leadership in educational circles, particularly in Texas, during the 1930's, 40's, and 50's. As such, this paper will not reexamine Eby's general educational ideas but will diverge and present a more intensive examination of his experiences during the last five years of the nineteenth century and, more importantly, what he had to say later in his career about the personages with whom he came into everyday contact: John Dewey, William Rainey Harper, and during his years while pursuing his doctorate at Clark University from 1898 to 1900, G. Stanley Hall.

Whether in the final analysis one agrees or disagrees with Eby's assessment of the period, one must recognize him, at the very least, as an eyewitness to some of the most momentous happenings in American educational history: the founding of the laboratory school at the University of Chicago as well as the concomitant events ensuing therefrom. More specifically, it was during the winter or spring quarter of 1896 that Frederick Eby enrolled in John Dewey's first course in educational philosophy at the University of Chicago. The exact time is uncertain and the accounts by Eby in his old age vary.[2] But it was while Eby was a student in this class that Dewey distributed mimeographed copies of twelve lectures to the class. These lectures are possibly the earliest extant examples of Dewey's classroom teaching. Eby later used these lectures, which he carefully preserved through the years, as an "ace in the hole" in an attempt to publish his own assessment of Dewey's Chicago experience in exchange for his allowing the lectures to be published.[3]

In 1893, while Frederick Eby was in the midst of his undergraduate years at McMaster University, a Baptist institution then located in Toronto, he visited the Columbian Exposition in Chicago and came into contact for the first time with the fledgling University of Chicago, newly opened under Baptist auspices.[4] A Menonite by birth, Eby changed as a youth to the Baptist faith. Moreover, upon completing his doctorate in 1900, Eby taught for nine years at Baylor University, one of the leading Baptist universities in America, although he spent the great majority of his career, from 1909 until his retirement in 1957, at the University of Texas in Austin.

In 1895, upon his graduation from McMaster, Frederick Eby enrolled at the University of Chicago as one of the first graduate students in a department which, at the time, included philosophy, psychology and pedagogy and was chaired by the newly arrived John Dewey.[5] During the first two years, Eby was also assigned to teach, part-time, a four-year-old future Librarian of Congress and poet by the name of Archibald MacLeish. His mother, Mrs. Andrew MacLeish, wife of the vice president of the Board of Trustees of the University of Chicago, was impressed by Dewey's theories on the value of handwork in a child's education. Recalled Eby, "she insisted that I should spend Saturday in her home, teaching this little boy how to make things with his hands."[6] Summing up the experience for *Time* magazine in 1957, Eby sniffed "A good thing Archie didn't catch on; he might have become a carpenter instead of a poet."[7]

In addition to attending the university during the 1897-98 academic year, Eby was hired to teach the eighth grade at Morgan Park Academy, then a preparatory school for the University of Chicago. While at Morgan Park, Eby caught William Rainey Harper's enthusiasm for the kindergarten. This ultimately led him to G. Stanley Hall's writings on the kindergarten. Becoming enamored with Hall, Eby transferred in 1898, without finishing a degree from the University of Chicago, to Clark University in Worchester, Massachusetts. There, Hall taught and was

president. At the end of these two years, Eby's doctoral dissertation entitled "The Reconstruction of the Kindergarten," was dedicated by G. Stanley Hall, who served as his dissertation director as well.[8]

The Dewey Lectures Correspondence

Frederick Eby's extant professional and personal papers are now on deposit in the archives of the Texas Collection at Baylor University. Comprising over 212 file boxes, the papers were donated to Baylor University over a period beginning in 1970 and extending to May, 1982, when the last installment of the papers was received. Most significantly, among the final papers to arrive were the lectures from John Dewey's 1896 philosophy of education class. Following the death of Frederick Eby in February, 1968, at the venerable age of 93, all of his papers were kept for a time by the Eby family in Austin, Texas. The story of how the Frederick Eby papers ultimately were to be donated to Baylor University instead of the University of Texas, where Eby spent 46 of his 57 years as a university professor, is indeed a classic saga of the politics of modern education and publication.

Shortly before John Dewey's death, Frederick Eby wrote to Dewey disciple Boyd Bode in December, 1950:

> I was a member of the first class in the philosophy of education which Dr. John Dewey taught at the University of Chicago. I believe it was the winter quarter of 1895-1896. . . . I am in possession of . . . Dr. Dewey's typed, mimeographed lectures on the philosophy of education. The thought has occurred to me that they might be of interest to his friends and might be published so that the earliest sources of his thinking might be available. . . . Your close association with Dewey has led me to make this inquiry — perhaps it ought to be sent directly to him. I shall be glad to hear your view of these matters.[9]

To this query, Bode quickly wrote back in the faltering script of a very old man: "Your recent letter interests me considerably. Your suggestion should be thought about carefully. Better leave Dewey out of this for the present. His indestructable modesty would lead him to side track the whole business."[10] Bode referred Eby to the John Dewey Society, then headquartered at the University of Connecticut. Eby subsequently received a positive reply of interest from them, along with a suggestion that the lectures be published as one of a series of "special interest" books the Society was introducing.[11]

However, after two years of silence and after Dewey's death in 1952, the Dewey Society once again wrote a series of letters to Eby in 1953, inquiring if he were still interested in publishing the lectures. If it was agreeable to him, Eby was asked to send the lectures "collect" to the Society for authentication and examination purposes.[12] In the meantime, news of the lectures had reached the editor of *Educational Theory*, who expressed an interest in getting the Dewey material "into print at the

earliest possible moment."[13] A similar proposal was made to Eby by Lawrence Metcalf, then Associate Editor of *Progressive Education*.[14]

While all of this was happening, evidence of new activity from Eby indicated he was beginning his own research on Dewey's Chicago period. In letters of inquiry to the University of Chicago Library, Eby asked several questions concerning the Dewey-Harper correspondence, the Harper-Julia Bulkley correspondence, and the circumstances surrounding Dewey's appointment to the University of Chicago in 1894.[15] This was the last heard from Frederick Eby on the matter of the Dewey lectures for the next six years.

In the meantime, Eby retired from his position at the University of Texas in the spring of 1957 with considerable fanfare, including notice by *Time* magazine in an article entitled "Goodbye Messrs. Chips."[16] The Soviet Union had also launched their Sputnik in late 1957, and in 1958, in response to this, Frederick Eby published a short 94-page monograph entitled *Reorganizing American Education for World Leadership* in which he blamed progressive education for the quandary in general and John Dewey in particular.[17]

Eby's silence was broken finally on the matter of the Dewey documents in November, 1959, with a letter to Robert McCaul, Dewey scholar and professor at the University of Chicago. Eby now mentioned for the first time a new ingredient in the saga. "You recall of course the materials I have, written by Dr. Dewey. I am finishing an introductory statement with regard to the founding of the University (of Chicago), President Harper's plans for its organization, (and) the history of Dr. Dewey, especially with regard to his interest in religion, philosophy and education."[18] What Eby had been doing over the past six years was researching and writing his own 116-page "introduction" to a volume that would include the unpublished Dewey material, but would also be prefaced by Eby's interpretation of the events which transpired in Chicago at the turn of the century.[19]

By the spring of 1960, Eby had submitted his expanded monograph to The University of Texas Press. Their reaction to Eby's lengthy introduction was, at best, cool.

> Your introduction has been read by several members of our staff and all of us think that it is most interesting, but we do question the wisdom of publishing such a detailed analysis . . . as an introduction to the Dewey source material. . . . We think that a much shorter introduction, one which is confined to setting the stage for the Dewey material to follow, would be much better. . . .[20]

The University of Texas Press Director also went on to mention to Eby that the University of Chicago was very interested in publishing the lectures as well but without the lengthy introduction. They had even sent a man to Austin to negotiate the matter with the Texas Press.[21]

But in a follow-up letter, the University of Texas Press added more salt to Eby's wound by sending him a copy of an evaluation of his introduction written by an "outside reader." The name of the evaluator and other identifying information were scratched out on the copy Eby received. The evaluation was quite devastating and frank, making several criticisms, most important of which was the query as to whether Eby was writing from personal recollection or from documented evidence. If from documentation, it was not nearly extensive enough. If from personal recollection, this was certainly not clear in Eby's script.[22]

This new input infuriated Eby, who set about promptly to find another publisher for his work. Those approached over the next few years included Rutgers University, the University of Michigan, and *Educational Theory* once again, with further inquiry received from the University of Chicago asking Eby to deposit the lectures there without publication. Also, beginning in 1962, what was to become the Center for Dewey studies at Southern Illinois University at Carbondale began writing to Eby in hopes of getting the Dewey material published or at least deposited there. This correspondence continued up until 1967, the year before Eby's death.[23]

Eby's response to all of this was, in effect, that if he couldn't publish his introduction, then the Dewey lectures would remain unpublished and untouched by anyone else. Typical of the kinds of responses Eby gave to the hopeful publishers was this rejoinder sent to the editor of *Educational Theory:* "Now that Dr. Dewey's philosophy has been pretty well tested . . . and found to be far from adequate perhaps people will be willing to have the whole truth frankly presented."[24] And in letters to an official at the University of Michigan, Eby stated that the dilemma

> is one of the most intricate and intriguing in all our history of education. To make the historical situation clear and truthful is no easy matter. Dr. Harper gave Dr. Dewey the biggest opportunity ever offered to do a highly constructive . . . work. Instead Dewey used the opportunity to set up a new . . . philosophy. All the other institutions in the university were distinctly religious. . . . The so-called Dewey School was not. The result in the end was that President Harper asked Dr. Dewey to resign.
>
> These are the facts. Please return the materials. I hope I have not been too burdensome in asking your counsel in the matter.[25]

It was not until after Frederick Eby's death on February 10, 1968, that the final chapter of the saga was to unfold. On December 5, 1969, Eby's daughter, Mrs. Helen Eby Craig, wrote the following in a letter to the noted evangelist, Billy Graham:

> You are the only person in my life I have ever heard lash out against John Dewey with the exception of my late father, Dr. Frederick Eby. . . . In my late father's papers are some unpublished lectures of Dr. Dewey's which he received as a student at the University of Chicago. . . . The University of Chicago would very much like to get these unpublished lectures as would the University of Texas but neither of them was willing to take them

when my father insisted that his prologue must be published with them. . . .

What to do with the "Dewey" papers has perplexed me . . . and until I heard your sermon the other night I had no idea what we would do about them because my father the week before he died . . . was still uncertain . . . We discussed it and he had no solution. Perhaps you have.[26]

Mrs. Craig received a reply two months later, in February, 1970, from one of Graham's assistants.

Your letter to Mr. Graham was gratefully received and he has asked me to reply. I have no more use for the philosophy of John Dewey than you have or your father had, and I think it was impolite and inexcusable for the University of Chicago and the University of Texas to take the stand they did regarding your father's prologue.

Nevertheless . . . the Dewey material should be given to a university . . . It should be given with no strings attached. . . .

Dr. Graham has just spoken at Baylor University in Waco, and I think that this school undoubtedly would be happy to receive the material. It . . . has a fine Christian undergirding. . . .[27]

The records in the Baylor University archives office show that the first Eby material was on file at Baylor in June, 1970, within four months of the receipt of this letter. From then until March, 1982, when the Dewey lectures were transported from Austin by myself, a steady stream of Eby materials passed to the Baylor University archives.[28]

It should be added that when asked why Baylor University was chosen over the University of Texas for the depository, Mrs. Craig said that the Billy Graham exchange actually had nothing to do with the decision. She said she was generally disappointed at the time that the other members of her father's department at the university were not in agreement with her father's religious views. Moreover, the later decision not to entrust the University of Texas with the Dewey lectures and with her father's now controversial introduction was made after the University of Texas apparently lost a series of tapes made of her father's class lectures. These tapes had great sentimental value for the Eby family and had originally been deposited in the library of the College of Education at the University of Texas.[29]

Contrary to the advise from the Graham organization, the Dewey lectures were donated to Baylor University with definite strings attached. The lectures were acquired only after an agreement was negotiated by Baylor's archivist with Mrs. Craig that access to the lectures and the Eby introduction would be restricted to those receiving written permission from Mrs. Craig. When I was granted the right to begin work on the Eby/Dewey documents in April, 1982, Mrs. Craig's permission was granted only after it was agreed that the Eby introduction would be published with the Dewey lectures.[30]

In the preface to his unpublished introduction to the Dewey lectures, Frederick Eby wrote:

> This small volume is a contribution to the literature commemorating the centennial of the birth of Dr. John Dewey. . . . It contains . . . documents which he wrote, but which have never been published. They came into my possession when a student at the University of Chicago in 1896. . . . In the Introduction the compiler undertakes to present the facts concerning the founding of the school. The time has come to place it in historical perspective regardless of the personalities involved. So far no one has traced the tangled circumstances. . . .[31]

Frederick Eby also mentioned on the second page of his introduction, why 1959 was such an appropriate time for this presentation of "the facts." The year, he said, recorded not only the one hundredth anniversary of America's leading philosopher," but also the publication "of the most devastating scientific theory of modern times," as well as the discovery of "a new source of power." These forces, continued Eby, are all tied together "in the story of a new school based wholly on an American philosophy of education" which radically changed this country's educational system. John Dewey was the philosopher, the theory was biological evolution, and the source of power was oil as channeled through the Rockefeller family to the University of Chicago. "How these three . . . brought about a revolution in American thought and education is clarified by the documents herewith published for the first time."[32]

John Dewey

After a lengthy narrative about the founding of the University of Chicago under Baptist auspices, Frederick Eby contended that in 1896 when Dewey opened his laboratory school it "was originally intended to fit into the overall program of the University. . . ."[33] When Dewey was appointed to be head of the Department of Philosophy and Pedagogy at the University of Chicago, said Eby, this was a crucial event. "He was virtually entrusted with the responsibility of finding some harmony between the new biological theory (evolution) and Christian theology. . . ." His writings, up to the time he was hired, "indicated that he was a believer in theism."[34]

The trouble was that Dewey "was motivated by a pertinacious ambition to be a philosopher and a social reformer."[35] Thus, to the faculty of "the Christian University of Chicago" was appointed a man whose duty it was to organize an elementary school "to serve as the model for all people to instruct and bring up their children." Dewey's writings had given President William Rainey Harper "substantial assurance that he was a true believer in God and respecter of the Christian faith."[36] Eby then quoted from a letter by James A. Tufts, written to Harper in support of Dewey's candidacy for the Chicago position in 1894. Tufts said that Dewey was "a man of religious nature," and a "church member" who believed "in working with the churches."[37]

Events subsequently proved that Tufts was in error, continued Eby. Dewey, instead, "found that he must alter his beliefs and accept a nontheistic point of view." His new philosophy "found no place for religion, especially in the form of Christianity." Moreover, his laboratory school was established "on a social-pragmatic basis which was designed to show that the Christian religion is not essential to education." The result of this "anti-Christian situation was shock and resentment for the . . . pastors who had assisted in the founding of the University."[38] "Dr. Dewey was an ugly duckling in their clear pool; to President Harper, he was a thorn in his side, but to the intellectual radicals, he was the graceful swan which symbolized the correct way to the true, the beautiful, and the good."[39]

The core of Eby's charges against Dewey is found in a section entitled "Was Dewey's professional behavior cricket?"[40] In its origin, said Eby, "the University of Chicago was avowedly and openly Christian." When Dewey was appointed, moreover, "he was known from his writings as a confirmed believer in God." But almost immediately after accepting the appointment, "a profound alteration in his views of religion began to take place. . . ." He had every right to change his religion, asserted Eby, "but to accept a position in a strictly Christian institution and then enter upon radical alterations in his beliefs" which were completely contrary to the ideals of the founders of the university created a definite ethical problem.[41] "The question may rightly be raised: Was it cricket for him to impose his anti-Christian views upon the Elementary School which belonged to the university . . .?" When Dewey altered his theistic concept of religion, said Eby, it was "his duty as an honorable man to sever his connections" with the university.[42]

> Let no one raise the sneer of religious bigotry. We are not condemning him for changing from a theistic to a nontheistic position, but merely . . . pointing out a fact — his principles led him to aggressively oppose the Christian position and this disqualified him from participating in the program for which the institution was avowedly established. After all religious people have rights which are as inviolate as those of their detractors. If the doctrine of experimentalism be correct, then it follows that even the Baptists have a right to carry on a school and try out their beliefs without subversion by enemies from within.[43]

In concluding his prologue, Eby said that Dewey was "unalterably opposed to the original essence of the Christian ethos. . . ." He was opposed to the basic conception that views the universe as two separate worlds, the natural and the supernatural. All such childish concepts, said Eby, "are now shown to be utterly absurd." Thus, Dewey "became intent on destroying the myth that the human being has some special factor, soul, ego or spiritual essence. . . . Darwin's theory of evolution disposed of this hocus pocus. . . ."[44]

William Rainey Harper

Frederick Eby's assessment of William Rainey Harper, President of

the University of Chicago during the Dewey years, was as positive as his assessment of Dewey was negative. Long before 1959 Eby considered Harper a misjudged historical figure. In 1942, for example, Eby wrote a letter of complaint to *Atlantic Monthly* regarding the favorable treatment Dewey had received at the expense of Harper in an article published in that magazine by Max Eastman. "With regard to your portrait of Dr. John Dewey . . . the effort to blacken the character of President Harper was wholly unnecessary. . . ."[45] Later, in a letter written to James B. Conant in early 1959, Eby proclaimed that the real trouble with the American educational system "arose some 60 to 70 years ago when the American college system declined to follow the leadership of President William Rainey Harper. . . ."[46]

At the beginning of Eby's introduction to the Dewey monograph, Eby stated that the paper furnished an appropriate time to "set straight a goodly number of misconceptions, errors and downright misstatements . . . which reflect upon the rectitude of William Rainey Harper."[47] Thus, "the amazing accomplishments of this multiple genius have never been incorporated in any adequate measure in the history of American education."[48] As an organizer and administrator in higher education, "Harper was on an equity with the great moguls of industrialism. . . . Harper aimed to provide Christian education for all," and his plan "embraced instruction, both secular and religious" in one coordinated program. "It was a spiritual brotherhood. For to Harper's mind, as he worded it, 'The search for Truth is the search for God.'"[49]

But instead of the proper acclaim due him, Eby asserted that there was, on the part of the Dewey faction, "a conspiracy of silence and a distortion of historical truth" about Harper's important role. This was typified by the appearance of a book entitled *The Dewey School*, "441 pages written by two of Dewey's supporters which does not once mention Harper's name."[50] Contrary to Dewey's plan, proclaimed Eby, Harper's covered both secular and religious education and "visualized education as a synergistic enterprise . . . in which all parents, churches, associations, states, colleges, professors . . . are animated by the same spirit of magnanimity." The University of Chicago had, therefore, "originated in the outpouring of Christian generosity."[51]

Summing up the relationship of Harper to Dewey, Eby stated:

> Here were two of the most remarkable minds of the age — the one in the realm of the organization of Christian education, the other in the philosophy of education, attempting to cooperate. . . . Harper's mind was most deeply intent on promoting a truly Christian education for all. . . . Dr. Dewey was to be his chief counselor . . . in this stupendous enterprise. . . . (Instead) Dewey staged an experiment in how to . . . equip children for . . . community living.[52]

G. Stanley Hall

Another sidelight found in the Frederick Eby Papers, and certainly

touched on in his introduction to the Dewey lectures as well, is Eby's assessment of G. Stanley Hall. If Harper was viewed by Eby in a positive light, G. Stanley Hall was practically put on a pedestal by Eby. During the winter quarter of the 1896-1897 academic year at the University of Chicago, Frederick Eby first became acquainted with Hall. As Eby recalled: "I heard G. Stanley Hall deliver an address at a meeting of teachers. . . . It was my impression that for a science of education a knowledge of the development of children was essential. It was that conclusion that led me in the fall of 1898 to go to Clark University."[53]

About his years at Clark, there exists in the Eby correspondence a number of letters written in 1962 to one Dorothy Ross, then a doctoral student at Columbia University. Ross was at the time writing her dissertation on G. Stanley Hall.[54] The letters were never incorporated into Ross' writing. They do, however, offer a rich source for tapping Eby's recollection not only about Hall, but also about Dewey, Harper, and others.

As Eby wrote to Dorothy Ross,

> In the fall of 1898 I went to Clark University to finish my graduate work. After a few days I received an invitation from Doctor Hall to go to his private office . . . to discuss . . . a doctor's dissertation. . . . When he learned that I had been in Chicago and was a student under . . . Dewey he became deeply interested. When he learned that I had in my possession . . . documents written by Dr. Dewey he was immediately anxious to see them. The next day he left for Chicago where he was to deliver some addresses. . . . About two years later (1900) I was passing through Chicago. . . . I stopped off to see a former friend who had charge of teaching manual training in the Dewey School. He disclosed to me that when Doctor Hall went to Chicago he did not go to see Doctor Dewey for they were not on speaking terms. This is a curious story that Mr. (Fred W.) Smedly told me. He said when Mr. Dewey was at John Hopkins University, Doctor Hall called him in his office and explained to him that he did not have the capacity to take a doctor's degree. As a matter of fact, Dewey did write his dissertation under the direction of Doctor Hall but they were not in any way friendly.[55]

Speaking about Hall as opposed to Dewey, Eby wrote that Ross was "inquiring into the mind of one of the brainiest men America . . . ever produced." But then Eby added, "Now I want you to imagine another different kind of . . . mind, an analytical, penetrating, speculative thinker who . . . was of the utilitarian . . . way of thinking." Eby added that he could not "imagine any two minds more utterly different than these two."[56] In another letter to Ross, Eby called Hall "the most widely knowledgeable American mind. But the strange thing is despite all of Hall's work in child development and adolescence you never see him quoted or his works referred to. There must be some reason."[57]

Here Eby is implying, as he did with Harper, that some conspiracy is afoot to conceal Hall's contributions to education. In a later letter to Ross, he talked of the cliquishness among some of the great names in American educational history, of how William James and Charles S.

Pierce were both close friends, and of how both of them disliked Hall. Also, since James and Dewey were close, this was a factor in the breakdown in the relationship between Dewey and Hall. In concluding this story Eby reminded Ross, "Believe it or not, men of such high calibre have their differences . . . when Hall received his appointment at Hopkins he was marked as a man to be discredited by others especially James and Pierce. . . . One thing is certain. A curtain of silence has been let down against Doctor Hall. I am sure you will find that to be the case."[58]

This same theme of a conspiracy of silence is at least implied in Eby's prologue to the Dewey lectures as well. "It is a curious fact," he wrote, "that the literature of pragmatic-generic psychology and education never mentions the work of G. Stanley Hall, who inspired the movement" and did more to "investigate the development of the human being than any other man. His basic ideas were accepted but not much credit was ever given him directly. Rumor had it that a clash of interests when Dewey studied under Hall at Hopkins caused a permanent rift."[59]

Concerning Hall as a teacher, Eby had nothing but praise. He recalled that in his lectures and seminars Hall was always friendly. "He did not have that stand-offish, superior air of the German professors. One was perfectly free to express his own ideas and even criticize Hall. . . . No man in his day could compete with him. . . . He was unquestionably the most widely informed scholar on the continent."[60]

Eby also contended that President Harper had a very high regard for Hall.

> If he had not he would not have taken away a sizeable group of scientific professors from Clark University. . . . I am also convinced that Harper's views in a broad way were far more similar to those of Hall than to those of Doctor Dewey. . . . As Doctor Hall started out to prepare for the ministry in German theological study and Doctor Harper was interested in exactly the same line of thought, I am sure they must have had much in common. . . .
>
> Now as to Doctor Dewey, . . . he was a man of a different sort of mind. His drift was pragmatic and utilitarian. He represented the left wing of New England thinking in regard to religion. . . .[61]

Conclusion

For Frederick Eby, John Dewey was not unlike the true believer who had strayed from the fold, never to return. Dewey was the angel Lucifer, cast from heaven into hell, there to reign over the antithesis of everything that was good, true and moral. For Dewey's deeds in leading a nation astray from the path of traditional education, Eby never forgave him. One who has strong political or religious feelings will often reserve his most fervent hatred for those who have once known the "truth" and then rejected it, as opposed to those who have never belonged. Such was the case with Frederick Eby and his judgment of John Dewey.

One major theme in Eby's writings was a general tendency to venerate both William Rainey Harper and G. Stanley Hall, claiming sinister plots to besmirch their reputations with a conspiracy of silence perpetrated by the Dewey forces. Eby also emphasized Dewey's lack of professionalism for staying in Chicago for ten years when he supposedly was not wanted. But the most troublesome implications in the Eby prologue is his rendition of the events surrounding the resignation of Dewey at the University of Chicago in 1904. In addition to the fact that Eby had left Chicago by the time of the event in question and, therefore, could not speak from personal recollection, there is absolutely no bonafide, prima facia evidence in the form of letters, documents, etc., that Dewey's resignation was prompted by any other reason than the one imparted in most historical accounts — namely, the "flap" over the decision by Harper not to renew Mrs. Alice Chipman Dewey's contract as principal of the Elementary School for the 1904-1905 academic year.[62]

Eby's scenario of an embarrassed Harper looking for a way to sever the heretic Dewey from the university is, however, at least a plausible theory. The University of Chicago in 1904 was still firmly under the control of the American Baptist Church, as well as the straight-laced John D. Rockefeller. Also, anyone who has spent any time at all in a university community realizes that what some university presidents tell their department chairmen in writing does not always correspond to their private thoughts or what they privately say to the university's benefactors. But these kinds of suppositions can never be the tools of the student of history. In spite of all of these interesting theories proposed by Frederick Eby, there is no hard evidence that Harper was dissatisfied with Dewey's performance at Chicago — that Dewey was a "thorn" in the side of President Harper, as Eby put it. There is not even a statement by Eby that he had heard this as a rumor while a student at Chicago. If there had been even a hint of such a rumor, Eby would have most certainly relished in retelling it. Instead, after days of trying to get Dewey to reconsider, Harper wrote a letter to Dewey, finally accepting Dewey's resignation some three weeks after it was originally tendered.

> I cannot think that in taking this step you have fully considered all the facts in the case. The desire of the university that you should continue your work . . . has been earnest and strong. . . . As I have told you, I regret exceedingly to learn that you did not share with me the understanding reached . . . last spring, that it would be Mrs. Dewey's pleasure to withdraw from the principalship. . . .[63]

The above hardly sounds as though Harper was glad to see Dewey leave. It should also be added that nowhere in Eby's prologue does he state what he had written to a publisher three years later in 1962 — that Harper had asked Dewey to resign.

As to the memo written by James A. Tufts supposedly extolling Dewey as a Christian to President Harper, Eby took one sentence, and only one, from a very long letter, ninety-five percent of which dealt with Dewey's qualifications as a scholar. There are four sections in the Tufts'

memo. The first section entitled "His record and ability as scholar," takes up the first three pages of a four page letter. Sections II, III, and IV, which contains the sentence about Dewey's religious colorings, are all contained in a few lines on the fourth and last page. It could hardly be assumed from this letter, therefore, that a major reason for Dewey's being hired at Chicago in 1894 was his religious orthodoxy.[64]

In general, most of Frederick Eby's 116 page prologue is noticeably under-documented, particularly the controversial portions of the paper. As many writers grow older and certainly after their writing has achieved recognized status, there is often a tendency on their part to proclaim a thing to be so because they say it is so and not because they can prove it is so. Writing in 1959 at the age of 85, at the end of a long and distinguished career, Frederick Eby seems to be doing just that.

It would be nice to stand before you at this time to unveil the proof for a new revisional interpretation of one of the best known fights in educational history. Sadly, though, on the basis of the material contained in the Eby introduction, and on the basis of existing records, the prevailing explanation for the resignation of John Dewey from the University of Chicago must, in my opinion, stand.

Notwithstanding the above conclusion, the writings of Frederick Eby provide a unique look into one of the richest and most controversial periods in American educational history. Eby was an eyewitness to much of what today has become legend. If his picturing of these legends does not always correspond to the standard view, it should, however, be accepted as at least one man's interpretation of these events — an essentialist present at the conception of the American educational progressive movement.

Notes

[1] Frederick Eby, "Dewey as Educational Reformer: Some Unpublished Writings," (unpublished manuscript on deposit with the Frederick Eby Papers, The Texas Collection, Baylor University), pp. 113-115. Hereafter, this manuscript will be cited as "Introduction." Also, hereafter, "the Frederick Eby Papers" will be cited as "FEP."

[2] The question of exactly when Eby enrolled in Dewey's class is further complicated by George Dykhuizen in his biography of John Dewey, *The Life and Mind of John Dewey*, (Carbondale, Illinois: Southern Illinois University Press, 1973), p. 87, where he states that because of other pressing matters, Dewey did not give a course in pedagogy during the 1895-96 academic year but, beginning with the 1896-97 year, taught several courses including educational philosophy. Whether Dykhuizen considered a course in educational philosophy as a philosophy course or as a pedagogy course is not clear. There is, however, a definite discrepancy between what Eby had said and what Dykhuizen says here. There is also the possibility that Dykhuizen was in error about the years.

[3] Reginald Archambault, ed., *John Dewey, Lectures in Philosophy of Education: 1899*, (New York: Random House, 1966). This is a complete set of Dewey's 1899 lectures published after discovery in the library at Grinnell College in 1963. In the introduction to this book, Archambault recognizes the Eby lectures as examples of earlier writings by Dewey. See also Arthur Wirth, *John Dewey as Educator: His Design for Work in Education, 1894-1904*, (New York: John Wiley, 1966). Although there is one set of lectures, presently in the possession of Dr. Joe R. Burnett of the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, which appears to be a duplicate of Eby's lectures, these lectures of Eby's are certainly among the earliest of Dewey's class lectures presented at the University of Chicago.

[4] McMaster University is presently located in Hamilton, Ontario, but when Frederick Eby attended there, it was located in Toronto.

[5] Ibid., Dykhuizen, p. 79. The author tells us that Dewey was actually only in residence at the University of Chicago during the summer and fall quarters of 1894-95. Thus, when Eby arrived at Chicago in the fall of 1895, Dewey was apparently in his first full year in residence as well.

[6] James L. Rhodes, "The Life and Times of Frederick Eby" (unpublished PhD dissertation, University of Texas, Austin, Texas, 1959), p. 86.

[7] *Time*, "Goodbye, Messrs. Chips," July 15, 1957, p. 54.

[8] Frederick Eby, "The Reconstruction of the Kindergarten," (unpublished PhD dissertation, Clark University, Worchester, Massachusetts, 1900), 58 pages. The most complete information about the chronology of Eby's activities at the University of Chicago and Clark University can be found in the *National Cyclopedia of American Biography*, (1973) s.v. "Eby, Frederick," Vol. 54, pp. 485-486.

[9] Letter from Frederick Eby to Boyd Bode, December 23, 1950, FEP.

[10] Letter from Boyd Bode to Frederick Eby, January 7, 1951, FEP.

[11] Letter from I.N. Thut, Executive Secretary of the John Dewey Society to Frederick Eby, January 22, 1951, FEP.

[12] Letters from Thut to Eby, February 13, 1953; March 3, 1953; and March 18, 1953, FEP.

[13] Letter from Archibald Anderson, Editor, *Educational Theory*, to Professor J.G. Umstaad, College of Education, University of Texas, January 17, 1953, FEP.

[14] Letter from Lawrence Metcalf to Frederick Eby, March 4, 1953, FEP.

[15] Eby's original letter of inquiry to the University of Chicago Library has been lost, but the university's reply to Eby which mentions Eby's letter was written on March 13, 1953. Eby's reply to this letter was dated March 19, 1953, FEP.

[16] Ibid., *Time*.

[17] Frederick Eby, *Reorganizing American Education for World Leadership*, (Austin, Texas: The Steck Company, 1958).

[18] Letter from Frederick Eby to Robert L. McCaul, School of Education, University of Chicago, November 23, 1959, FEP.

[19] Ibid., Eby, "Introduction."

[20] Letter from Frank H. Wardlaw, Director, University of Texas Press, to Frederick Eby, March 29, 1960, FEP.

[21] Ibid.

[22] Letter from Wardlaw to Eby, July 15, 1960 accompanying the anonymous letter from the "outside reader," undated, FEP.

[23] The first letter of several from "The John Dewey Society" at Southern Illinois University was written by George Axtelle, Director, to Frederick Eby on September 27, 1962. The final letter was sent to Eby from Joann Boydston, Project Director of the Co-operative Research on Dewey Publications, January 3, 1967.

[24] Letter from Frederick Eby to Archibald Anderson, Editor, *Educational Theory*, August 12, 1960, p. 2, FEP.

[25] Letters from Frederick Eby to Claude A. Eggertsen, School of Education, University of Michigan, August 12 and 30, 1961, FEP.

[26] Letter from Helen Eby Craig to Billy Graham, television evangelist, December 5, 1969, FEP.

[27] Letter from Sherwood E. Wirt, Editor, *Decision*, (published by the Billy Graham Evangelistic Association) to Helen Eby Craig, February 17, 1970.

[28] All correspondence between Helen Eby Craig and the Director of the Texas Collection Library, Baylor University, is on file in the office of the library.

[29] Telephone conversation between Helen Eby Craig and Barry Westfall, July 9, 1983.

[30] This document signed by Mrs. Craig and dated April 5, 1982, is also on file in the office of the Texas Collection Library. There is a separate signed statement by Mrs. Craig granting me "permission to examine and make use of" the Dewey Lectures and the Eby introduction "in accordance with the plans which he has discussed with me." The proposal made to Mrs. Craig in late March, 1982, when the Dewey lectures were acquired, was that an edited and condensed version of the Eby prologue would be published along with the Dewey lectures.

[31] Ibid., Eby, "Introduction," pp. i-ii of preface.

[32] Ibid., p. 2.

[33] ibid., p. 32

[34] Ibid., p. 58.

[35] Ibid., p. 62.

[36] Ibid., p. 82.

[37] Ibid., Here, also, Eby quotes Robert L. McCaul, "A Preliminary Listing of Dewey Letters, 1894-1904," *School and Society*, October 10, 1959, Vol. 87, No. 2159, pp. 395-399. The original letter from Tufts is reprinted in this article by McCaul, but the letter itself is found in the William Rainey Harper Personal Papers, Special Collections, Regenstein Library, University of Chicago.

[38] Ibid., Eby, "Introduction," p. 82.

[39] Ibid., pp. 82-83.

[40] Ibid., p. 84.

[41] Ibid., p. 85.

[42] Ibid., pp. 85-86.

[43] Ibid., p. 86.

[44] Ibid., p. 112.

[45] Letter from Frederick Eby to *Atlantic Monthly*, February 7, 1942, regarding an article published in the December, 1941 issue, pp. 671-685.

[46] Letter from Frederick Eby to James B. Conant, January 6, 1959, FEP.

[47] Ibid., Eby, "Introduction," p. 2.

[48] Ibid., p. 19.

[49] Ibid., pp. 22-23.

[50] Ibid., p. 23. See also Katherine Camp Mayhew and Anna Camp Edwards, *The Dewey School: The Laboratory School of the University of Chicago, 1896-1903*, (New York: D. Appleton-Century, Inc., 1936).

[51] Ibid., pp. 25-27.

[52] Ibid., pp. 83-84.

[53] Letter from Frederick Eby to Dorothy Ross, October 4, 1962, FEP. See also Rhoads, p. 81.

[54] Dorothy Ross, "G. Stanley Hall, 1844-1895: Aspects of Science and Culture in the Nineteenth Century," (unpublished PhD dissertation, Columbia University, New York, New York, 1965, 530 pages. This dissertation was later published under the title *G. Stanley Hall: The Psychologist as Prophet*, (Chicago, Illinois: University of Chicago Press, 1972), 482 pages.

[55] Letter from Eby to Ross, September 15, 1962, FEP.

[56] Ibid.

[57] Letter from Eby to Ross, March 29, 1962, p. 2, FEP.

[58] Letter from Eby to Ross, October 4, 1962, FEP.

[59] Ibid., Eby, "Introduction," p. 72.

[60] Letter from Eby to Ross, October 4, 1962, FEP.

[61] Letter from Eby to Ross, October 16, 1962, FEP.

[62] The best source which thoroughly recounts this rather involved story is Robert L. McCaul, "Dewey and the University of Chicago," *School and Society*, Vol. 89 (1961), pp. 152-157, 179-183, and 202-206.

[63] Letter from William Rainey Harper to John Dewey, Secretary of the Board of Trustees Correspondence, Special Collections, Regenstein Library, University of Chicago, April 27, 1904.

[64] Ibid., Memo from Tufts to Harper.

The Dewey School: A Record of Success and A Reality of Failure

DR. CHRIS EISELE
ILLINOIS STATE UNIVERSITY

Introduction

Some years ago I read Maxine Greene's 1959 article, "Dewey and American Education, 1894-1920."[1] I tucked away what I thought to be its central thesis — that Dewey didn't have much influence on his time — and proceeded with other research on Dewey. Ten years of reading history of education texts with their generally positive accounts of the Dewey School kept clashing with the memory of Greene's article. However, the din did not become loud enough until I was working with a colleague on an AERA presentation, "Dewey and DeGarmo: A Curious Anomaly in the History of Teacher Education Curricula."[2] Our research uncovered a "textbook history" of the 1890-1910 period which might be *generously* labeled "inaccurate." The primary material I read suggested a picture of the Lab School different from the familiar. I decided to pursue the matter.

My title reflects the basic thesis of this paper. The first part, "The Dewey School: A Record of Success . . . ," describes the way the Dewey School or Lab School has been portrayed as historically important in most, if not all, history of education texts. That is, the Dewey School appears to have started something good or successful. Not atypical is this quotation from Brubacher's, *A History of the Problems of Education*, "The experimental elementary school directed by John Dewey at the University of Chicago after 1894 was one of the first and foremost examples of the new, or progressive education."[3] The second part of the title, "The Dewey School: . . . a Reality of Failure," suggests that Dewey's Lab School did not finish what Dewey set out to accomplish and probably did not establish a precedent that led to a later accomplishment of Dewey's goals. As Arthur Wirth (one of the few historians to investigate the Laboratory School in depth) puts it, "in the Chicago decade Dewey developed a far-reaching framework for the study of and improvement of education. He left the University in 1904 with the total effort barely underway and his projected design largely unrealized."[4] What follows is evidence offered to support these assertions through, first, a review of the purposes of the Lab School found in primary material of the period.

SECTION I — FAILURE

The Purpose of Dewey's Laboratory School

In an 1883 article titled, "Place and Function of the Model School," Charles DeGarmo outlined four possible functions of lower schools attached to teacher training institutions. One of the functions, "to originate and test new ideas and methods . . . (which) shall be put to practical test by experienced teachers," would take place in what DeGarmo called an "experiment school."[5] Whether Dewey had such a concept in mind by the time he was considering William Rainey Harper's job offer to leave Michigan for Chicago in early 1894 is not certain. However, within 6 months of his arrival at Chicago, Dewey was petitioning Harper for a Department of Pedagogy containing a school along the lines of DeGarmo's "experiment school." Although the language is obscure, Dewey's intent is not.

> If the work undertaken and planned in psychology and ethics is to be what it should be, it is highly important that it be closely related to work in pedagogy. Even if the opportunity for a department in pedagogy were not the most (as it is in my judgment) the most promising of any now offered to a University especially in the west — it is a practical necessity in order to give practical illustrations of checks upon the work in Psychology and Ethics.
>
> On the other hand, the work thus far done in Pedagogy in this country has been comparatively useless; it has been mechanical and vague because separated from psychology and social ethics, or else an artificial deduction from a purely deductive psychology. Ethics and Psychology are to Pedagogy, rightly undertaken, what the theoretical study of scientific principles is to work in a laboratory.[6]

Dewey continued to approach Harper for support and continued to argue for the laboratory concept. Writing in 1896, probably not long after the Laboratory School had gotten underway in January, Dewey listed reasons for additional support, including, "Without this no pedagogical department can command the confidence of the educational public it is seeking to lay hold of and direct; the mere profession of principles without their practical exhibition and testing will not engage the respect of the educational profession. Without it, moreover, the theoretical work partakes of the nature of a farce and imposture — it is like professing to give thorough training in a science and then neglecting to provide a laboratory for faculty and students to work in."[7]

Dewey also went public with his plan about the same time, writing "A Pedagogical Experiment" for the June, 1896, issue of *Kindergarten Magazine*. He explained the laboratory nature of the school in the first paragraph.

> The school is not a school of practice in the ordinary sense; nor is the main object of the Pedagogical Department to train teachers. It rather takes teachers who have already considerable experience, and who now wish to acquaint themselves more thoroughly with the rational principles of their subject, and with the more recent educational movements. . . . The primary school serves the purpose of a focus to keep the theoretical work in touch with the demands of practice, and also makes an experimental station for the testing and developing of methods which, when elaborated,

may be safely and strongly recommended to other schools. It is believed that there is nothing which our common schools need more than wise guidance in this respect — the presentation of methods which are the offspring of a sound psychology, and have also been worked out in detail under the crucial tests of experience.[8]

Several decades later, in 1936, looking back on his Chicago days, Dewey wrote clearly about the function of the Lab School in *The Dewey School*, a book by two former Lab School teachers.

> Thus the name *Laboratory School* (originally suggested by Ella Flagg Young) gives a key to the work of the school. A laboratory is, as the work implies, a place for activity, for work, for the consecutive carrying on of an occupation and in the case of education the occupation must be inclusive of all fundamental human values. A laboratory also implies directive ideas, leading hypotheses that, as they are applied, lead to new understandings. It demands also workers, who without being enslaved to the past, are acquainted with achievements of the past in science and art, and who are possessed of the best skills that have been worked out by the cooperative efforts of human beings.[9]

The Influence of the Laboratory School

I have emphasized, perhaps over-emphasized, the laboratory function of the Dewey School in the quotations above to make clear what the school was — in order to contrast with what it was not. It was not intended to be a "progressive school." As Dewey says in another section of the 1936 Mayhew and Edwards book, "the school by intention was an experimental school, not a practice school, nor (in its purpose) what is now called a 'progressive' school."[10] This phrase echoes an earlier one from the same book, "The controlling aim of the school was not the aim of present *progressive education*," and was repeated 3 years later by his daughters, who attended the school, in a brief biographical statement about Dewey — "The school was not a practice or progressive school as the terms are used today."[11] Dewey is clear on the difference.

> It will be noted that the social phase of education was put first. This fact is contrary to an impression about the school which has prevailed since it was founded and which many visitors carried away with them at the time. It is the idea which has played a large part in progressive schools: namely, that they exist in order to give complete liberty to individuals, and that they are and must be "child-centered" in a way which ignores, or at least makes little of, social relationships and responsibilities. In intent, whatever the failures in accomplishment, the school was "community-centered." It was held that the *process* of mental development is essentially a social process, a process of participation; traditional psychology was criticized on the ground that it treated the growth of mind as one which occurs in individuals in contact with a merely physical environment of things. And, as has just been stated, the *aim* was ability of individuals to live in cooperative integration with others.[12]

Given the differences Dewey describes, it is little wonder that this strong disassociation from certain aspects of Progressive Education in 1936 was

followed 2 years later by *Experience and Education*, a very critical analysis of Progressivism containing an attempt to further clarify the "social meaning of experience."[13]

The mere existence of *Experience and Education*, now a well known book, should suggest to any historian that the degree of Dewey's actual direct influence in American schooling is at least problematical in the 1930s and 1940s. The evidence found in Maxine Greene's article mentioned in my "Introduction," which supports a lack of influence in the earlier years is even more convincing. She notes, for example, "a look at the *Addresses and Proceedings* of the NEA in the years immediately following Dewey's Chicago experiments shows us that his work impressed public-school teachers little, if at all. . . . In the ensuing years, nothing of significance can be found in the NEA discussions with relation to the Chicago experiments."[14] Harold Rugg, a younger colleague of Dewey's and one of Greene's sources, is more figurative in his appraisal of Dewey's impact, "During the next decade (after 1904) his influence was at a low ebb."[15] Dewey, himself, suggests that the Laboratory School was less than successful in the quotation from the Mayhew and Edwards book above, "whatever the failure in accomplishment, the school was 'community-centered'." Earlier in the same book his estimate is more harsh, "Like every human enterprise the Laboratory School came far short of achieving its ideal and putting its controlling ideas into successful operation."[16] Rugg affirms this personal estimation by Dewey, "I am told by those who knew him well that he regarded his work in educational reconstruction of little avail."[17]

The above does not mean that during its seven year history the Lab School went unnoticed. Such is not the case. Dewey's work was recognized at the time — perhaps more clearly than at any time since — as experimental work. Recognition, however, does not entail influence. George P. Brown writing in *The Public School Journal* said in describing the Dewey School, "The first reflection upon this school is that it is not a school in the prevailing meaning of the term. It is an educational experiment station of a great university."[18] Brown went on to say, "We all hope the experiment will be continued long enough to show to what extent interest can supercede authority, . . . and *spontaneity* can take the place of an appeal to *will* without injury to the best education of the child."[19] A similar comment can be found in the *Journal of Education* under the name of Harriet Farrand, "The School is unique and its progress is watched by educators all over the land. Its managers do not consider that it is perfect yet by any means, but as fast as they see defects they are striving to remedy them."[20] And the *Chicago Tribune* concurred in an editorial note, "Professor Dewey's school will be watched with profound interest and hopefulness," a metaphor seconded by Dewey's former colleagues at Michigan, Burke Hinsdale, writing on "Educational Progress During the Year" for the NEA, "More eyes are now fixed upon the University Elementary School, at Chicago, than upon any other elementary school in the country, or probably in the world — eyes watching to see the outcome of the interesting experiment."[21,22] Even in

the letter writing campaign to President Harper mounted to save the Lab School during the consolidation period in 1901 suggests a waiting-to-see-the-outcome flavor. DeGarmo, for example, writing from Cornell, said, "We at Cornell want you to know that we are immensely interested in Doctor Dewey's experiment, and in having it continued. . . . We would regret to see the experiment stop at an immature stage."[23]

From these comments it seems safe to conclude that one major reason Dewey's work was not influential at the time is precisely because his peers recognized the nature of it and rightly waited for its conclusion. As George Locke, a Chicago faculty member put it in his letter to Harper, "At the recent meeting of the Superintendents I met a great many men from different parts of the country and the chief topic of conversation with them was the progress that is being made in our elementary school. They felt that the school had passed the probationary stage and was now in such position that results could be hoped for which would prove of great value in the general work of education in the schools of this country."[24] Dewey's separation from Chicago and the Lab School in 1904 brought an inopportune end to his experiment — prior to the type of conclusion for which educators were waiting.

Conclusion

I have tried to establish above that two of the ways of measuring the Lab School — influence at the time and influence over time — do not show the Lab School as a success. There is a third way in which Dewey's work might be counted as having been successful. If Dewey's ideas had been taken seriously, other institutions would have taken up the study of education along similar lines. Seven years after the Lab School work ended, Dewey was still pressing the idea, "In short, laboratory experimentation, or adaptations of the technique of the psychological laboratory, will show what methods in current use are most effective under conventional conditions; they will not test the relative worth of the conventionally current type of education as compared with some suggestive reformed type. . . . For the latter purpose, special experimental schools . . . are absolutely indispensable."[25] It seems almost needless to point out that we do not now and have (almost) never attempted to duplicate the work of the Laboratory School. In fact, no aspect of Dewey's thought has been more ignored than his writing of the value of "Education as a University Study," to use the title of one of his articles.[26]

With the above arguments and examples in mind, it seems to me that the Lab School resulted in a "reality of failure," even though it has had, I will now try to show, a "record of success."

PART II — SUCCESS

The Record

In Maxine Greene's article she says the following, after looking at historians' accounts of the 1894-1920 period, "The judgment's of educational historians are summary, often contradictory; and they change with vantage point in time."[27] She is too kind. A vast majority of the 30-plus textbooks I reviewed missed the point of what Dewey was trying to accomplish or misunderstood what actually happened. For example, Henry Perkinson, Harry Good and V.T. Thayer discuss *The School and Society* as an outgrowth of the Lab School in their texts without making a connection to the experimental nature of the school. Robert Ulich goes so far as telling us (apparently Dewey's own writing is not to be believed) how Dewey thought, "We may question whether the educational ideas of Dewey are the result of mere practical observation and experimentation — for which he had opportunity as director of the School of Education at the University of Chicago from 1894 to 1904 — or are part of a general system of thought. In Dewey's case the latter is true, as in the case of most great educators."[28]

The function of the Laboratory School has elicited a variety of interpretations from different textbook authors, although the testing of pedagogy is seldom one of them. Gerald Gutek in *A History of the Western Educational Experience* says, "From 1896 to 1903, Dewey directed the University of Chicago Laboratory School, where the chief object was to create a free and informal learning community in which each student was a participant."[29] Harry Good and James Teller in their *A History of Western Education* say that "The school was experimental in the sense that the children, under guidance, experimentally determined their own curricula and methods." In an earlier section they suggest an even larger goal for the Lab School, "the transformation of schools and of their relation to society."[30] Even in those texts which basically describe the experimental nature of the Lab School accurately, the focus is on testing Dewey's theories, not on developing a science of education. Edward J. Power in *Evolution of Educational Doctrine* says, "Yet, even as a university man, he maintained some contact with the lower schools and organized the Laboratory School — as much a laboratory for him as a school for students — to test the meaning of his educational ideas on the crucible of day-to-day teaching and learning."[31] And R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin in *A History of Education in American Culture* say, "Largely through his efforts, The Laboratory School at the University of Chicago was founded in 1896 to implement his progressive ideas."[32]

Many, but not all, texts represent the school as a success:

1. Frank Graves in *A History of Education in Modern Times* says, "Hence, while the Chicago school is now at an end, the experiment in education developed there is still yielding abundant fruitage. It has stimulated similar undertakings elsewhere, and has greatly influenced both the theory and practice of the present day."[33]

2. Edgar Knight in *Education in the United States* says, "This and other

principles which he set forth (in *School and Society*) served to modify and improve school practices not only in this country but in many other countries as well."[34]

3. I.L. Kandel in *American Education in the Twentieth Century* says, "The practice and principles first developed there were then applied in a number of experimental and university laboratory schools. Ultimately but in modified form they found their way into public schools in different parts of the country."[35]

4. William French in *America's Educational Tradition* says, "(the Lab School) offered a type of education that was unattainable in the conventional school, but it blazed the way for many educational innovations."[36]

5. Adolphe Meyer in *An Educational History of the Western World* says, "On American education the immediate influence of Dewey's seeking and probing was almost nothing."[37]

Conclusion

None of the 30-plus books I reviewed offered what I believe Dewey would have seen as accurate reports of his involvement with the Lab School. None emphasized what he emphasized — the need for a pedagogical laboratory. Most emphasized what he de-emphasized — theory isolated from practice, the development of *a* curriculum and the questionable link between his work and Progressivism. Even Lawrence Cremin in the *Transformation of the School* emphasizes the Lab School as a school rather than a unique attempt to combine both the theory and practice of education in a controlled setting, "the nerve of the whole scheme" according to Dewey, in one letter to Harper.[38] With the exception of Meyer, most history of education texts present a "record of success."[39]

PART III — CONCLUSION

I am going to borrow some of my conclusion from other sources because I feel that textbooks written by historians of education are partly responsible for conditions described by other authors, especially in terms of the material focus of this paper. Near the end of Joe Burnett's answer to his own question, "Whatever Happened to John Dewey?" he says, "The general conclusions I draw are that Dewey's educational philosophy seldom was applied, seldom was understood. Its confusion with romantic progressivism still abounds, and that intellectually inchoate congeries of ideas is both significant cause and effect of educational drift."[40] A perfect example to fit the bill drawn up by Burnett is the historical treatment of the Lab School period. History of education texts have too often failed to point out that Progressivism was not Deweyism, in many instances. In fact, the texts have been part of the problem, instead of being part of the solution, through their failure to deal carefully with complex primary materials. The "drift" Burnett speaks of is gener-

ally missed by many textbook writers who have lumped all progressives together and failed to point out important educational differences — differences that in this case would show that Dewey's ideas generally failed to carry the day.

A second author whose thinking is exemplified by this analysis is found in the NSSE Yearbook for 1971 which focused on the topic, "The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect." Dean Robert Schaefer of Teachers College reaches a series of conclusions in his chapter which opens the volume; two of which are relevant here. Dean Schaefer believes that the "Field of education (has been) abdicated by the university as a whole and preempted by the schools of education."[41] He uses Butler and Columbia as an example, but Dewey's Chicago would fit just as well. What historians of education in their texts have generally failed to do is make clear that universities — especially in Dewey's case — were ever even considering the serious investigation of a science of pedagogy. Thus we may have historically lost a viable and potentially important agent of educational change; perhaps a necessary one in a generally moribund system.

A second point made by Schaefer is that, "Experimental schools (have been) conceived less as laboratories for inquiry and more as exemplars of particular prescriptive theory," a conclusion reinforced by the findings here. As he says, "Even the accounts of Dewey's Chicago school primarily provide a careful historical record of a school's efforts to use materials and methods based upon broad, philosophical principles; they do not reveal systematic, cumulative, laboratory-based analyses of aspects of the teaching-learning process or of the individual child's interactions with materials."[42] History of education textbooks, I have tried to show, have failed to deal with Dewey's experiment on its own experimental terms, choosing for the most part to write as advocates of a particular theory.[43]

I have two of my own conclusions. The first is obvious — historians of education have not done a very good job on the history of the Lab School, especially in textbooks. The second conclusion is more speculative. I believe it is safe to say that either Progressive Education failed as a movement — or that we never tried it. In either case, perhaps one reason is that we never learned to train Progressive teachers. If that is the case, I again hold historians partly responsible. We are the ones who failed to write a convincing history of the education of Progressive teachers, or lack thereof. An education that began with Dewey and the Lab School in the Department of Pedagogy at the University of Chicago and probably ended there in an unmarked grave.[44]

Notes

[1] Maxine Green, "Dewey and American Education, 1894-1920," *School and Society* 87 (10 October 1959): 381-386.

[2] Dent Rhodes and Chris Eisele, "Dewey and DeGarmo: A Curious Anomaly in the History of Teacher Education Curricula" (Paper delivered at the American Education Research Association, Montreal, Canada, April 15, 1983).

[3] John S. Brubacher, *A History of the Problems of Education*, 2nd ed. (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966), p. 389.

[4] Arthur G. Wirth, "John Dewey's Design for American Education: An Analysis of Aspects of his Work at the University of Chicago, 1894-1904," *History of Education Quarterly* 4 (1964): 83; see also, Arthur G. Wirth, *John Dewey as Educator: His Design for Work in Education (1894-1904)*, (New York: John Wiley and Sons, Inc., 1966).

[5] Charles DeGarmo, "Place and Function of the Model School," *Education*, 4 (November, 1893): 168.

[6] John Dewey to William Rainey Harper, "Pedagogy: Memorandum," President's Papers, 1889-1925, University of Chicago, December 1894(?): 1.

[7] John Dewey, "The Need for a Laboratory School," *The Early Works, 1882-1898*, v.5, (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971), p. 434.

[8] John Dewey, "A Pedagogical Experiment," *The Early Works 1882-1898*, v.5, (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1971), p. 244.

[9] Katherine Camp Mayhew and Anna Camp Edwards, *The Dewey School*, (New York: Atherton Press, 1966), p. 7. As Bill Eaton put it in a letter commenting on this paper, "The guinea pigs in this laboratory were really the teachers and not the children!"

[10] Ibid., p. 464.

[11] Jane M. Dewey, "Biography of John Dewey" in *The Philosophy of John Dewey*, ed. by Paul Arthur Schilpp, (Chicago: Northwestern University, 1939), p. 28.

[12] Mayhew, *Dewey School*, p. 467.

[13] John Dewey, *Experience and Education*, (New York: Collier Books, 1963). As Alfred L. Hall-Quest puts it in the Editorial Forward, "*Experience and Education* is a lucid analysis of both 'traditional' and 'progressive' education. The fundamental defects of each are here described." p. 9.

[14] Greene, "Dewey," p. 384.

[15] Harold Rugg, *Foundations for American Education*, (New York: World Book Co., 1947), p. 554. I am not suggesting that Dewey was ignored by the education community. In fact, with the publication of *How We Think* in 1910, Dewey's thinking became a major justification of educational practice. I doubt, however, that it was Deweyian practice.

[16] Mayhew, *Dewey School*, p. 7.

[17] Rugg, *Foundations*, p. 554,555.

[18] George P. Brown, "Dr. John Dewey's Educational Experiment," *Public School Journal* 16(June 1897): 536.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Harriet A. Farrand, "Dr. Dewey's University Elementary School: An Experiment in Education," *Journal of Education* 48(1898): 172.

[21] *Chicago Tribune*, 10 September 1899, p. 32.

[22] Burke Hinsdale, "Educational Progress During the Year," *N.E.A. Proceedings and Addresses, 1900*, pp. 326,327.

[23] Charles DeGarmo to William Rainey Harper, President's Papers, 1889-1925, University of Chicago, 22 April 1901.

[24] George Locke to William Rainey Harper, President's Papers, 1889-1925, University of Chicago, 8 March 1901.

[25] John Dewey, "Experiment in Education," in *A Cyclopedia of Education*, vol. II, ed. by Paul Monroe, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1911), p. 551.

[26] John Dewey, "Education as a University Study," *Columbia Quarterly* 9 (June 1907): 284-290.

[27] Greene, "Dewey," p. 381.

[28] See, Henry Perkinson, *The Imperfect Panacea*, (New York: Random House, 1977), pp. 83-87; Harry Good, *A History of American Education*, (New York: Macmillan Co., 1956), p. 356; V.T. Thayer, *Formative Ideas in American Education*, (New York: Dodd, Mead and Company, Inc., 1965), p. 249; Robert Ulich, *History of Educational Thought*, (New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, 1968), p. 321.

[29] Harry Good and James A. Teller, *A History of Western Education*, (New York: Macmillan, 1969), p. 525,512.

[30] Gerald L. Gutek, *A History of the Western Educational Experience*, (New York: Random House, 1972), p. 385.

[31] Edward J. Power, *Evolution of Educational Doctrice*, (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1969), p. 342.

[32] R. Freeman Butts and Lawrence A. Cremin, *A History of Education in American Culture*, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1953), p. 438.

[33] Frank Graves, *A History of Education in Modern Times*, (New York: Macmillan, 1925), p. 381.

[34] Edgar Knight, *Education in the United States*, (Boston: Ginn and Company, 1941), p. 522.

[35] I.L. Kandel, *American Education in the Twentieth Century*, (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1957), p. 107.

[36] William French, *America's Educational Tradition*, (Boston: D.C. Heath, 1964).

[37] Adolphe Meyer, *An Educational History of the Western World*, (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), p. 472. Meyer's prose must be read to be believed. I heartily recommend it in small doses. One of the few sources to agree with Meyer, at least in my research, is Harold Benjamin in *John Dewey and the World View*, Douglas E. Lawson and Arthur E. Lean, eds., (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1964), "I do not agree with the view that this school was very important. . . . The Laboratory School did not have any great impact on the course of the educational revolution." (pp. 23, 24.) Robert L. Church, *Education in the United States*, (New York: The Free Press, 1976), p. 260 has a different version of success. He correctly says Dewey was influential with thinkers, although this effect on practice is not explained. I doubt most student readers would catch the distinction.

[38] Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*, (New York: Vintage Books, 1961), pp. 135-142.

[39] Of course it is not just historians who err in their portrayal of the Lab School. Harold Rugg and Ann Shumaker's *The Child-Centered School*, (New York: Arno Press, 1969), one of the standard works on the "new" schools are as off-center in their descriptions as any history of education text (see pp. 38-39) — even getting Mrs. Dewey's first name wrong.

[40] Joe Burnett, "Whatever Happened to John Dewey?" *Teacher's College Record* 81 (Winter 1979): 202.

[41] Robert J. Schaefer, "Retrospect and Prospect," in Robert McClure, ed., *The Curriculum: Retrospect and Prospect, The Seventieth Yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education, Part I*, (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1971), p. 17.

[42] Ibid., p. 19.

[43] Again, it is not only historians who are at fault. Kilpatrick writes an eerie account, "It is of course true that not all who saw it or heard about it were so stirred. . . . One such rejecter, known to this writer, was so strategically placed in American education that his subsequent prejudice did damage (as the writer sees it) which even yet is positively active. William H. Kilpatrick, "Dewey's Influence on Education," in Schilpp, *John Dewey*, p. 461.

[44] Thanks to Bill Eaton and Dave Angus for comments on the original presentation of this paper.

PART II
Shaping Educational Policy: Models From the Past

The Woman Peril: As A Barrier to the Rise of Women Teachers — 1890-1920.

Patricia A. Carter
University of Cincinnati

The Woman Peril: As A Barrier to the Rise of Women Teachers — 1890-1920

In 1982 the Christian Century magazine published a news article about an Illinois jr. high school teacher who had been charged with "negligence and immorality" for giving birth to a son. The teacher was a single woman, a former nun, who had become pregnant as the result of a rape. When the schoolboard gave her the option of resigning her job or giving the baby up for adoption she refused. On dismissing her from her position, the board said in part. "Your conduct in becoming pregnant outside the state of marriage has diminished your ability to teach and the ability of your students to learn their lessons from you."[1] Though after a year in court she was reinstated, her ordeal resulted in an extended illness and hospitalization. Her lawyer felt, and the hearing officer agreed, that though the board pursued the case strictly as a moral issue, the teacher's activities as a teacher-organizer played a large but underlying factor in the board's attack on her.

Incidents such as this are frequent in the long history of institutional control over the private lives of female educators in the American public school system. Due to the public nature of teaching and the expectation that teachers should act as role models for their students, teaching has been, perhaps, *the* occupation most controlled by community mores. Societal expectations regarding appropriate female sex role behaviors have placed an additional burden on the woman teacher. While male educators have been expected to adhere to certain assumptions about the masculine role, for the most part these assumptions have not interfered with their personal preference, whether to date, marry and father children. However, during the period between 1890 and 1920, community ideals about a woman's role in the family often served to create barriers to her mobility in the profession. The following paper is an examination of some of the arguments which promoted concepts about the limitations on women educators resulting from perceptions regarding their biological and mental inferiority.

At the turn of the twentieth century teaching was a common experience for many women since few other professions were open to educated women. The advent of the common school, a greatly increasing immigrant population, industrialization, westward expansion and the emergence of urban centers, were factors which contributed to the need for an expanded teaching force. As early as 1850 the growth in public school enrollment was unyielding. Massachusetts, which had one of the

most comprehensive school systems in the country, increased its size by more than fifty percent between 1840 and 1860.[2] By the end of the Civil War at least twenty percent of all women in Massachusetts had been teachers at some point in their lives.[3] Between 1880 and 1890 the percentage of female teachers in the country increased from 57.2 percent to 65.5 percent. By 1900 that figure had risen to 70.1 percent and in 1910 78.9 percent of the U.S. public school teachers were women.[4]

The emergence of women into the teaching profession came at the urging of school leaders who had suggested that women would provide a solution to many of the problems of the overburdened school systems. They reasoned that schools could save money and stretch dollars further by employing women who would teach for considerably less than their male counterparts.[5] Aside from the monetary benefits, many of these leaders defended the increased employment of women teachers on the grounds that women were more easily regulated than men since they had little interest in fortune or social status. Of their virtues Horace Mann wrote:

> Their minds are less withdrawn from their employment, by the active scenes of life; and they are less intent and scheming for future emoluments. As a class, they never look forward, as young men almost invariably do, to a period of legal emancipation from parental control, when they are to break away from the domestic circle and go abroad into the world, to build up a fortune for themselves.[6]

Women were hardly in the position to build up a fortune for themselves even if they had the desire to do so. As early as 1840 the inequities in pay for women teachers were quite clear.

Comparison of Wages Paid to Male & Female teachers in 1840.[7]

State	females	males
Maine	$ 4.80 a month	$15.40 a month
New Hampshire	$ 5.65 a month	$13.50 a month
Vermont	$ 4.75 a month	$12.00 a month
Connecticut	$ 6.50 a month	$16.00 a month
New York	$ 6.69 a month	$14.96 a month
Pennsylvania	$10.09 a month	$17.02 a month
Ohio	$ 8.73 a month	$15.42 a month
Indiana	$ 6.00 a month	$12.00 a month
Michigan	$ 5.36 a month	$12.71 a month
Massachusetts	$ 8.07 a month	$24.51 a month

While few within the teaching profession were ever paid a living wage, this obvious inequity in salaries continued throughout the century and into the 1900's. In 1890, females teaching in the northeastern part of the

U.S. were paid, on an average, a monthly wage of $38.56, while male teachers made $56.50 a month.[8] There were attempts to remedy this situation, but due to the financial burdens that increased pay for women teachers would create, few school boards were convinced of the merits of equal pay.

Discrimination against female teachers was not limited to salary. Women also had little opportunity for advancement. While men could move from the position of teacher to supervising teacher, to principal and eventually to superintendent, the woman's career pinnacle was almost always where she began, as a classroom teacher. Those exceptional women who earned principalships usually did so in elementary schools, where the bias against women as administrators was a little less harsh.[9] By 1905 men still held 91.9 percent of all high school principalships in cities with populations of one million or more. In cities with a population between 200,000 and one million, men held 93.7 percent of those positions. In cities which had 100,000 to 200,000 people 100 percent of all high school principalships belonged to men.[10]

Various reasons were given for the lack of upward mobility afforded to women teachers. Most often it was argued that teaching was only a temporary career for women who worked between graduation and marriage. In actuality, many school systems ensured that teaching would be temporary by insisting that women teachers' employment be terminated upon marriage. This was the case in Cleveland where the rule stated: "Marriage of a teacher shall be considered the equivalent of the resignation of her position."[11] Other systems allowed women to remain in teaching after marriage but discharged them when they became pregnant. Some school districts had even more restrictive policies, as noted by the following regulations from a 1915 Massachusetts school manual:

1. Do not get married.
2. Do not leave town at any time without permission of the school board.
3. Do not keep the company of men.
4. Be home between the hours of 8 pm and 6 am.
5. Do not loiter downtown in the ice cream stores.
6. Do not smoke.
7. Do not get into a carriage with any man except your father or brother.
8. Do not dress in bright colors.
9. Do not dye your hair.
10. Do not wear any dress more than two inches above the ankle.[12]

Women who chose to remain single and to be obedient to such codes regarding their conduct found themselves victim to another form of institutional harassment. As explained in the 1908 article "Celibate Education To-Day," a theory was promulgated that these "old maids" provided an abberant example of the female lifestyle. The fear was that such women teachers would set an example for young and impressiona-

ble students which would result in the eventual extinction of the race.

> The most fully developed woman is the mother, next the wife, and least of all is the "old maid." . . . Her married sisters, her parents and her brothers, even the children in the seats before her, all look on her as a failure in life . . . is it a good model to set before maturing minds that the unmarried woman is the best type of all?[13]

Such contradictory ideas about the personal life of the female teacher reinforced the image of her marginal status in the profession. Married or unmarried, women were clearly in a no win situation. Thus, it becomes apparent why teaching became known as a temporary career for women.

By maintaining women as a temporary work force the schools benefitted in several ways. First, this status helped to ensure a constant supply of newly trained teachers for the schools, informed on the latest pedagogical methods, and credentialed according to the everchanging standards of the day. Second, their short careers kept women from reaching seniority. Not only did this allow fewer women to move into supervisory roles, but it also reduced the number of raises awarded over the term of their employment. Third, a temporary work force helped to prevent unionized activity among teachers.

Despite the barriers which attempted to keep women powerless over their own personal and working lives, by 1910 it was clear that female teachers had begun to organize into professional unions. The establishment of these unions was particularly evident in the large urban areas where the influences of trade unionism and feminism were most potent. Both the leaders and the majority of members in these unions were female elementary school teachers. One of the first and most representative of this movement was the Chicago Teachers Federation (CTF) which formed in 1898. The CTF with the leadership of grade school teacher Margaret Haley soon exhibited interest in the doctrines of both trade unionism and feminism. In 1902 the members of CTF went on record as advocating suffrage.[14] Later that year they became the first urban teacher's union to join the American Federation of Labor.[15] Less than a year after it was founded the CTF represented over 2,500 members, more than half of all teachers in Chicago.

In New York City, the Interborrough Association of Women Teachers (IAWT) formed in 1906, primarily for the purpose of lobbying for equal pay for women teachers. Like its counterpart in Chicago, the IAWT found strength in numbers. By 1911, it was the representative of some 15,000 members. Influenced by the successes of the CTF and the IAWT, teachers in many other cities began to form similar organizations.[16] By 1910 Carter Alexander, author of a report on teacher's voluntary associations found, ". . . indications are that in at least half of the cities of 30,000 and upwards, there is at least one organization of teachers composed of women only."[17]

Between 1900 and 1920 there was some evidence that these organizations were being influenced by feminism. *The Woman's Journal*, a national suffragist newspaper, often reported on teachers' group which adopted planks in favor of suffrage and equal pay. The headlines told the story: "Teachers Want Votes — Kansas State Teachers' Association Unanimous for Woman's Ballot,"[18] "Women Get School Suffrage, Women Allowed to Serve on School Boards,"[19] "Women Teachers Can Participate, Birmingham Board of Education Will Not Prohibit Them from Suffrage Work,"[20] "Teachers Cheer Suffrage Speech, Bryan's Declaration That They Ought to Have Votes Wins Burst of Applause,"[21] "Boston Teachers Out in Favor, Say If Justice and Proper Pay Are to be, Women Must Have Ballot,"[22] "Teachers Ask for Equality, New Jersey Teacher's Association Endorses Full Suffrage for Women,"[23] "Teachers Choose Woman President — Nebraska Association Takes First Step Toward Equal Rights by Electing Miss McHugh,"[24] "Teachers Ask to Vote in Missouri Association of Educators, Says Interests of All Demand Women's Enfranchisement,"[25] "Teachers Learn They Need Vote, New Orleans Women Instructors Converted in Shoals to Suffrage by Unjust Action."[26]

Alice Stone Blackwell, the Journal's editor, noted that at the 1908 National Suffrage Convention a presiding officer asked all women who had been teachers to stand up and about one-third of the audience arose.[27] Blackwell's argument in favor of female teacher suffrage also appeared in the educational literature. In 1909, she asked the readers of the *Journal of Education (N.E.)*, "What is the reason for this lack of money for the schools?" She answered, "One reason is that the mothers and the teachers have no votes. Money can be found for purposes in which voters are interested."[28]

In many ways, teachers were perfect candidates for the tenets of feminism. The fact that they were underpaid and devalued provided adequate motivation to affiliate with feminist organizations. The women teachers had little hope of changing the school system from within, so outside support was necessary. Since many of the leaders of the woman's movement had once been school teachers themselves, they were particularly sensitive to the plight of the female educator. Lucy Stone, founder of the *Woman's Journal*, Susan B. Anthony, Lucretia Mott and Carrie Chapman Catt frequently acknowledged the lack of control they had felt as teachers. For each it had constituted one of the experiences that drew them to feminism.[29]

The fact that some women had begun to embrace feminism and unionization as a means to upgrade their status as teachers was perceived as a threat by many. Some reacted with unbridled hostility. This was the case of James Boykin of the Bureau of Education, who in 1899 provided a classic description of the fear that women were taking over education.

> To be sure there is little possibility that the change will progress to this extent, but the indications are that the end is not reached. . . . Conspicuous

> evidences of this may be found in the laws of many states . . . permitting women to vote in school elections, . . . and in the custom of political conventions in woman's suffrage states of habitually naming women for the office of state superintendent, . . . and in the action of the directors of the recent Trans-Mississippi Exposition at Omaha, who turned over their department of Education to women and practically confined their activities to that department alone.[30]

Others within the profession expressed similar sentiments to Boykin's. For instance, after several years of organization and lobbying within the National Education Association (NEA), in 1910, female teachers were able to elect Ella Flagg Young as the NEA's first woman president.[31] This obvious victory for women brought critical comment from many, including Charles W. Bardeen, a former director of the NEA from 1893 to 1897. In his article "The Monopolizing Woman Teacher" he wrote:

> Women were not made eligible to membership in the National Educational Association till 1866, but last year they took the bit in their teeth and ran away, smashing the carriage, and repeated the performance this year at San Francisco; like a young horse that has emerged from one escapade and learned his strength and the joys of kicking his heels in the air, they are never again to be trusted.[32]

With professionals providing such one-sided representations of women in the profession, it is no wonder that writers in popular magazines soon followed suit. In 1909, the *Popular Science Monthly* expressed a similar sentiment to Boykin's when its editor, former educator James McKeen Cattell declared:

> When spinsters can support themselves with more physical comforts and larger leisure than they would as wives; when married women may prefer the money they earn and excitement they find in outside employment to bearing and rearing of children, when they can conveniently leave their husbands should it suit their fancy — the conditions are clearly unfavorable to marriage and the family. . . . This vast horde of female teachers in the United States tends to subvert both the schools and the family.[33]

Arguments such as these fell into a category recognized in the literature as "the woman peril to education."[34] Between 1900 and 1915 over 76 articles were published in both popular and educational journals about the negative effect that women were having on education.[35] The "woman peril" arguments hinged not only on a fear for the future of men in the educational system but also for the changes that it might create for the dominant role of the husband. Though often internally inconsistent, these arguments espoused many popular sentiments about women. Some of the arguments were obviously based on theories from the then infant sciences of eugenics, sociology, biology, psychology, medicine and industrial management. Other arguments were founded on traditional religious and cultural beliefs that woman's proper sphere was in the home. While the sciences were believed to be strictly unbiased and technologically based, in reality the concepts about woman as different

from normal (i.e. man) pervaded the sciences and established the foundations on which the sciences were built. This is particularly evident in many of the so-called scientific rationales used against women as teachers.

By 1900 school leaders began to promote principles of industrial management theory in an effort to confront such problems as overcrowded classrooms, immigrant students, students from broken homes, and the lack of financial resources to deal with these and other problems. As order and efficiency began to be equated with maleness, women's predominance in the teaching force was viewed as detrimental to the system. Furthermore, as the schools began to respond to the industry's growing need for skilled workers, it was assumed that women were unsuited for training boys. The future was industry and boys had to be trained for that future. However, many believed that women teachers had a natural lack of discipline and were too sentimental to be suitable for training boys for the future challenges of the work world.

Thus, another theme within the "woman's peril" was based on a fear for the plight of the American boy. Several authors promoted the theory that women were inferior teachers for boys. Admiral F.E. Chadwick expounded on this idea in his treatise "The Woman Peril in American Education," in which he found:

> For generations the American boy . . . has been under woman tutelage. The effect of such procedure had had so evil an effect upon the manhood of the country, on the qualities that go for making the masculine character, that it is more than fulltime to consider . . . this great and vital question.
>
> To put a boy . . . under woman tutelage at his most impressionable, character forming age is to render violence to nature and a gross wrong and indignity to the boy; it is to do violence to the most precious possession . . . his soul.[36]

This same theme was carried out in R.L. Sandwich's article, "More Men in the Public Schools," in which he blamed women teachers for the escalating rate at which boys dropped out of school. He claimed:

> Women, as we have seen, are interested in the esthetic rather than the practical or the industrial side of life. In the boy's mind the grammar school with its corps of women teachers comes to associate education with the interests of women only. This I believe is one reason why so few take the step from grammar school to high school. At this age boys begin to notice differences of sex. They are proud of their masculinity. The voice changes, they are conscious of superior strength, and they love to show their muscle. They cultivate the gruffer ways of men . . . everything that is distinctly masculine is admired and imitated; everything womanish is despised. Few boys at this age are ready to admit that women are the equals of men.[37]

The British Mosely Education Commission, which often commented on American education provided another source of thought on the topic. Prof. Henry E. Armstrong of the Commission was quoted in the 1905 *U.S. Commission on Education Report:*

> To put the matter in very simple terms, it seemed to me on . . . my former visit . . . that the American boy is not being brought up to punch another boy's head, or to stand having his own head punched in a healthy and proper manner; that there is a strange and indefinable feminine air coming over the men; a tendency toward a common sexless tone of thought.[38]

Other authors expressed alarm that the biological functions of the woman teacher were impinging on her efficiency as an educator. Today, feminist historians Ehrenreich and English point out that "... theories which guided doctor's practice from the late nineteenth century to the early twentieth century held that woman's normal state was to be sick" and that "Medicine had 'discovered' that female functions were inherently pathological."[39] Such was the rationale of Charles Bardeen's second discourse on the physiological inferiority of women as teachers, in which he expounded on several reasons why women should not be allowed to teach after the age of twenty-eight. One of his first arguments is based on the fact that women menstruated.

> Women's chief disadvantage is the fact that in every month there are one or two days when she ought to be in bed, and yet when she must be in her place . . . This saps the life energy of every woman teaching in the public school.[40]

Bardeen's second reason was the future threat of menopause.

> Again, experienced boards have learned that there is another period, much longer and more trying, that occurs between forty and fifty, and that sometimes renders the best of women for a time impossible.[41]

In his third argument he extolled the woman teacher as "modest and self-respecting" but claimed that "few women of six years in a public school . . . have escaped indignity."[42] By way of clarification, he suggested that it was the men with whom women teachers worked who could not be trusted. According to Bardeen, sexual harassment was rampant in the schools. He also claimed that exposure to such treatment "produces in a teacher above twenty-eight a pessimism, a contempt for mankind, that is not healthful, and that boards of education shrink from."[43] Thus, he argued that this harassment was a natural response to women as sexual beings, and that women so offended by such treatment should be removed from their jobs for the sake of the schools.

Perhaps one of the most influential themes within the "woman peril to education" was based on the theory of race suicide. This theory, drawn from the science of eugenics, claimed that educated middle and upper-class women were not producing their share of children. It promoted the idea that white, middle class women, once educated and economically independent by securing jobs, were reticent to give up their freedom for husband and family. To a large degree, the idea stemmed from a fear that immigrants to America were "overbreeding" and that "the good old New England stock" was declining at an alarming rate.

Theodore Roosevelt, who became President of the United States in 1901, wrote and spoke widely about the dangers of race suicide. He abhored the growing divorce rate and the "selfishness" of women who limited their procreation to one or two children. He actively promoted the concept of separate spheres for women and men.

> The woman should have ample educational advantages; but save in exceptional cases the man must be, and she need not be, and generally ought not be, trained for a lifelong career as the family breadwinner, and therefore, after a certain point the training of the two must normally be different. This does not mean the inequality of function, but it does mean that normally there must be a dissimilarity of function. On the whole, I think the duty of the woman the more important, the more difficult, and the more honorable of the two; on the whole I respect the woman who does her duty even more than I respect the man who does his.[44]

According to Roosevelt, the woman's duty was to bear at least four children, inculcate in them the values of the middle class and thereby save the U.S. from being overpopulated by "inferior" nationalities.[45] Women teachers were especially sensitive to attacks about race suicide since they made up the largest class of educated working women. Furthermore, the fact that such theories were promulgated by the President provided many school leaders with the idea that it was their patriotic duty to establish regulations which would help to accomplish the President's goals of white, middle class propagation.

The sciences of evolution and psychology were not forgotten in the debate against female teachers. In 1891, *Educational Review* reprinted an article from the *Revue Scientifique* by M. Gustave Le Bon in which he sought to establish the place of these sciences in determining the effects of education on women.

> Within what limits can women profit by our system of education? What will they gain or lose, physically, morally, intellectually, by participation in it? What changes will such education effect in women as wives and mothers? To answer these questions a clear notion of the psychology of woman is necessary. The modern educator must study woman, her mental constitution and her aptitudes. . . .
>
> To understand the intellectual constitution of woman and to judge the effects of our system of education upon her, we must first glance at the facts of intellectual evolution among barbarian and half-civilized peoples. We are then struck by the close analogy which exists between the intellect of the woman and that of the primitive races. We find the same instability to reason, or to be influenced by reasoning; the same lack of control of the powers of reflection; the same absence of critical spirit; the same inaptitude to associate ideas, or to discover affinities or differences; the same indecision of opinion; the same habit of generalizing from a few particular cases; and of drawing inaccurate conclusions from them; the same want of precision and consequently the same impulsive character, easily swayed by the impulses of the moment.[46]

The woman teacher's response to attacks about the "woman peril"

was varied. Some responded by participating in the debates played out in the educational journals. One of the best examples of this is Chicago teacher Florence Hewitt's article, "The Reproof Valiant," in which she makes a scathing reply to Charles Bardeen's three part series, "The Monopolizing Woman Teacher."

> The cock-sure assumption of the man that he, and he only, knows what is the proper sphere of the woman, and that he can tell her just how to fill it, is so funny that we must smile and ask — with all proper deference: Where did he obtain his information and on what grounds does he consider himself worthy or capable of dictating to one-half of the human race? . . .
>
> "The monopolizing of the woman teacher!" Who monopolized the N.E.A. for half a century? . . . Women are not interested in civic affairs? . . . Witness the reforms already accomplished by women often in the face of indifference and opposition from the law-makers (and law-breakers) of these same cities . . . Isn't it about time that justice and modesty be considered virtues for men as well as for women and if the "proper study of mankind is man," that they change the subject of their study for a time and consider how they may improve themselves? It is not yet too late.[47]

Still, women were victims of both socialization and institutional sexism, and many of the teachers chose to take action through subterfuge. For example, while the "experts" were busy arguing over the merits of dismissing women from their jobs after marriage, many women teachers married secretly, retaining both their "maiden" names and their jobs. Their close teaching friends would attend the wedding, but the marriage was never mentioned inside the school yard.[48] This collective vow of silence created a sense of solidarity among women and men who participated in it.[49]

Another method of protest that was used by female teachers was that of litigation. When the collective vow of silence fell prey to informers and married women were fired, the courts became their next recourse. In New York City, the issue of whether a woman teacher could be fired for getting married was in and out of the courts for eleven years. Though the courts never found firmly in favor of married women teachers, the years spent in the courts eventually convinced the State Commissioner of Education, in 1916, to rule in favor of the teachers.[50]

A fourth mode of protest that was especially effective was that of publicity. The teachers used any method possible to create a public debate about their situation. To that end, alliances were formed with organized women's groups which had a certain appeal to the media. The "New Woman" was news and affiliation meant access to a public forum through which the teachers could depict their plight. In New York City, the Women Lawyers' Club, the Women's Political Suffrage Union, the League for Civic Services of Women, the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, and the Feminist Alliance, lent sympathy and actively promoted the causes of married teachers, equal pay, and "teacher-mothers" by holding conferences, debates and press interviews on these topics.[51] Articles published by *the Woman's Journal* about the activities

of women teachers around the country also helped to create a sense of networking between women in the city and in the country.

Given the attitudes regarding women teachers in the era between 1890 and 1920 it is ironic that this was a period in which they made many important gains in the profession. In a large sense, the successes of women teachers can be traced directly to the impact that feminism had on society during that same time. However, with the waning influence of the women's movement in the 1920's and the male takeover of many of the teacher unions by the 1930's, the personal and professional needs of women teachers were often relegated to an ancillary position. Thus, many of the successes were short term, creating the need to begin the struggles over and over in the years to come.

Notes

[1] Delloff, L.M., "Rape and Abortion in America," *Christian Century*, v. 99, Oct. 20, 1982, p. 1038.

[2] Melder, Keith, "Woman's Highest Calling: The Teaching Profession in America, 1830-1860," *American Studies*; v. 13, n. 2, 1972, p. 21.

[3] Bernard, Richard and Vinovskis, Maris A., "The Female School Teacher in Ante-Bellum Massachusetts," *Journal of Social History*; v. 10, Spring, 1977, p. 333.

[4] Woody, Thomas, *A History of Women's Education in the United States*; v. 1, The Science Press, New York, 1929, p. 499.

[5] Melder, "Woman's Highest Calling," p. 22.

[6] Mann, Horace, "Eleventh Report," *The Common School Journal*; v. III, 1840, p. 96-97.

[7] Woody, *A History of Woman's Education*; p. 492-493.

[8] "Table 6, Teacher's Salaries," *Report of the Commissioner of Education*; 1890-91, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1891, p. 17.

[9] "The Sex of Teachers in High and Elementary Schools," *Salaries, Tenure and Pensions of Public School Teachers in the United States*; National Educational Association, July, 1905, p. 52.

[10] "The Sex of Teachers," p. 52.

[11] Jessup, Walter, *Cleveland Education Survey: The Teaching Staff*; Cleveland Foundation, Cleveland, Ohio, 1916, p. 18.

[12] Zerfoss, Nancy, "School Marm to School MS.," *Changing Education*; Summer, 1974, p. 23.

[13] E.S., "Celibate Education Today," *Popular Science Monthly*, v. 73, November, 1908, p. 424.

[14] Chicago Teachers' Federation, "1902 Minutes," *Chicago Historical Society*, Jan. 25, 1902.

[15] Alexander, Carter, *Some Present Aspects of the Work of Teachers' Voluntary Associations in the United States;* Teachers' College, Columbia University, N.Y.C., 1910, p. 58.

[16] "Women Teachers' Victory Praised, Great Achievement of Miss Grace Strachan and 15,000 Women Teachers," *The Woman's Journal;* Nov. 11, 1911, p. 358.

[17] Alexander, Carter, *Some Present Aspects;* p. 83.

[18] "Teachers Want Votes — Kansas State Teachers' Association Unanimous for Woman's Ballot," *The Woman's Journal;* Nov. 25, 1911, p. 369.

[19] "Women Get School Suffrage, Women Allowed to Serve on School Boards," *The Woman's Journal;* July 20, 1912, p. 1.

[20] "Women Teachers Can Participate, Birmingham Board of Education Will Not Prohibit Them from Suffrage Work," *The Woman's Journal;* Dec. 21, 1912, p. 408.

[21] "Teachers Cheer Suffrage Speech — Bryan's Declaration That They Ought to Have Vote Wins Burst of Applause," *The Woman's Journal;* July 8, 1916, p. 224.

[22] "Boston Teachers Out in Favor, Say If Justice and Proper Pay Are to Be Won, Must Have Ballot," *The Woman's Journal;* April 24, 1915, p. 134.

[23] "Teachers Ask for Equality, New Jersey Teachers' Association Endorses Full Suffrage for Women," *The Woman's Journal;* Jan. 9, 1915, p. 9.

[24] "Teachers Choose Woman President — Nebraska Association Takes First Step Toward Equal Rights by Electing Miss McHugh," *The Woman's Journal;* Nov. 22, 1913, p. 369.

[25] "Teachers Ask to Vote in Missouri Association of Educators, Says Interests of All Demand Women's Enfranchisement," *The Woman's Journal;* Nov. 8, 1913, p. 360.

[26] "Teachers Learn They Need Vote, New Orleans Women Instructors Converted in Shoals to Suffrage by Unjust Action," *The Woman's Journal;* Nov. 1, 1913, p. 352.

[27] Blackwell, Alice Stone, "Do Teachers Need the Ballot?", *The Woman's Journal;* Oct. 31, 1908, p. 174.

[28] Blackwell, Alice Stone, "Do Teachers Need the Ballot?", *Journal of Education;* July 1, 1909, p. 8.

[29] Harris, Barbara J., *Beyond Her Sphere: Women and the Professions in American History;* Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn; 1978, p. 80.

53

[40] Boykin, James C., "Women in Public Schools," *Educational Review*, v. 18, June-Dec., 1899, p. 143.

[41] Smith, Joan K., *Ella Flagg Young: Portrait of a Leader*, Educational Studies Press, Ames, Iowa, 1979, p. 158-177.

[42] Bardeen, Charles W., "The Monopolizing Woman Teacher," *Educational Review*, Jan., 1912, p. 19.

[43] Cattell, James McKeen, "The School and the Family," *Popular Science Monthly*, v. 74, 1909, p. 91-92.

[44] Woody, Thomas, *A History of Women's Education*, p. 505-514.

[45] A survey of titles listed in the *Reader's Guide to Periodicals* for the years 1900 through 1914 provide at least 76 articles related to arguments surrounding the theme of the "Women peril to education."

[46] Chadwick, F.E., "The Woman Peril in American Education," *Educational Review*, Feb., 1914, p. 109.

[47] Sandwich, R.L., "More Men in the Public Schools," *Popular Science Monthly*, v. 65, Sept. 1904, p. 448.

[48] "Reports of the Mosely Commission," *U.S. Education Reports*, Washington, D.C., 1905, p. 7.

[49] Ehrenreich, Barbara and English, Deidre, *For Her Own Good: 150 Years of the Experts Advice to Women*, Anchor Books, Garden City, N.Y., 1979, p. 110.

[50] Bardeen, Charles W., "The Monopolizing Woman Teacher," p. 27.

[51] ibid

[52] ibid

[53] ibid, p. 27-28

[54] Roosevelt, Theodore, "American Problems," *The Works of Theodore Roosevelt*, (Hermann Hagedorn, ed.), Scribner and Sons, N.Y., 1926.

[55] "Mr. Roosevelt's Views on Race Suicide," *Ladies' Home Journal*, v. 23, Feb., 1906, p. 21.

[56] Le Bon, M. Gustave, "The Education of Women and its Effects," *Educational Review*, Jan., 1891, p. 101-102.

[57] Hewitt, Florence, "The Reproof Valiant," *Journal of Education (N.E.)*, June 13, 1912, p. 656-657.

[58] as described in "Teachers' Cases Go Over, Committee Postpones Hearings," *New York Times*, Nov. 12, 1913, p. 8.

[49] "Aided Mrs. Edgell Married Herself, Supposed Miss Rodman, Wadleigh High School Admits She is Mrs. Fremery." *New York Times;* March 19, 1913, p. 8.

[50] Keesecker, Ward W., *The Legal Status of Married Women Teachers;* pamphlet n. 47, Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1934, p. 17-18.

[51] for example see: "Mrs. Gamse Asks Clubwomen's Aid, Married Teacher Dismissed By Board." *New York Times;* Jan. 19, 1914, p. 7.

EDUCATION AS A FORM OF EMERGENCY RELIEF: THE NEW DEAL EXPERIENCE

Judith Sealander
Wright State University

In May 1933 at the height of one of the nation's worst depressions, the United States Congress appropriated $500,000,000 for federal relief of unemployment and authorized the country's new President Franklin Roosevelt to establish a system by which the funds could be distributed. Roosevelt created the Federal Emergency Relief Administration (FERA) with Harry Hopkins at its head.

From the beginning the new relief agency, under Hopkins, considered educational programs as potential recipients of funds. Federally sponsored schools, camps, workshops, and tutoring programs could act as a source of jobs for some of the nation's estimated 80,000 unemployed teachers. They could also provide training for some of the millions of other unemployed persons, who would become students and recipients of food, medical care, and the chance to participate in part-time paid work projects as well as schooling.

Between 1933 and 1942, first the FERA and then its successor the Works Progress Administration (WPA) sponsored education as a form of emergency reflief. By the time Dr. Win-the-War cured the country's unemployment problem, some 30,000 teachers had won jobs in federally sponsored education. Several million students sat in classes. The programs had no one central purpose. Federal funds went to the states, at the states' request, and state school officials exercised final control over the use of these resources for education. By the end of the thirties dozens of states had set up programs based in part on the availability of federal monies: among them, night schools to teach reading and writing to illiterate adults, "Americanization" programs with English and United States government courses for recent immigrants, classes and schools for unemployed workers.[1] Workers' education, then, about which I will speak today, existed as only one of many approaches to education which received federal sanction. An overview of workers' education as sponsored by the FERA and WPA and an examination in more depth of one particular workers' education project, the resident schools for unemployed women, cannot provide definitive answers about the worth of a very diverse relief effort. But such an analysis can illustrate some of the virtues and failings of an imaginative New Deal effort to broaden the definition of relief far beyond traditional notions of government distribution of soup and surplus clothing.

According to definitions generally accepted within the American labor movement by the 1930's, workers' education was a term used to describe

efforts to meet the educational needs of wage earners who had had little formal education. Such efforts offered industrial, office, domestic and agricultural workers opportunities to "train themselves in clear thinking through the study of those questions closely related to their daily lives as workers and as citizens."[2] Memos sent to federal administrators from local unions and state federations of labor stressed the need to make the focus of instruction current economic and social problems of daily concern to workers.[3]

In the 1930's workers' education in the United States was comparatively new, certainly if compared to programs of "folk" or worker training which had existed, with the help of government funds, in Scandinavian countries since the mid-nineteenth century. But by 1918 several individual American unions had established educational departments, night classes and summer schools for workers. By 1925 the Workers' Education Bureau and the Affiliated Schools for Workers attempted to act as national clearing-houses for what began to be called the worker education or labor education movement. Workers' education at the time of the Wall Street crash still found its most typical expression in evening classes taught at local union halls, but a dozen resident workers' schools, some with their own buildings, others housed in borrowed space, held classes. Most, like the Bryn Mawr Summer School for Women Workers in Pennsylvania, conducted short summer courses but one, the Brookwood Labor College in New York, established a year round curriculum.[4]

Led by a coalition of union leaders, college educators, and civic reformers, workers' education advocates sought to establish a national network of schools, weekend institutes, conferences and tutoring programs where workers could supplement inadequate formal educations by studying English, math, art, history and public speaking. Above all they were to study economics. An Affiliated School for Workers pamphlet on the purposes of workers' education explained that "The basic course in a workers' education curriculum is always the economics course. Some of the questions that are discussed in this course include: 'Why is there so much unemployment when there is such a need for the goods and services that the workers who are unemployed could produce? Why is it so difficult to get enough in the weekly pay envelope to provide for the bare necessities?'"[5]

Not surprisingly, these kinds of questions challenged not just the worker students, but also some of the movement's middle class sponsors who worried that the educational approach and teachers were too radical. As one disillusioned Bryn Mawr alumnus protested, "Can Bryn Mawr be condemned for asking the school to move on where it could study as little and picket as much as it wanted?"[6]

Given this tradition and a brewing climate of controversy, the surprise was not that the federal government included worker education as just one of a series of educational relief programs but that it included it at all. In the summer of 1933 Hilda Smith, former Dean of Bryn Mawr College

and a prominent fund raiser and supporter of worker education, came to Washington in hopes of securing government aid for some of the private worker summer schools.[7] Spencer Miller, head of the Workers' Education Bureau of the AF of L, came to Washington as well. Together, he and Hilda Smith lobbied federal officials, asking that unemployed teachers be put to work in the field of workers' education. William Green, President of the AF of L joined the campaign, bombarding the press with statements in favor of governmental educational programs for workers. In October of 1933, Harry Hopkins appointed Hilda Smith to establish a workers' education project underneath the relief umbrella of the FERA.

The entire Emergency Education program demanded close cooperation between federal, state, and local officials, a close cooperation that redefined traditional local dominance of education. Smith's first job was to convince state education officials and local school boards to approve workers' education programs. Letters sent to state school officials and state relief administrators explained policies "essential" to worker education. The teaching, Smith emphasized must be concerned with "economic and social problems related to the experience of the worker." Freedom of teaching and discussion were to be taken for granted and the right of workers to organize and bargain collectively was to be recognized. Classes were to be organized as democractic groups "with the teacher as a leader and one of the group, not as an authority."[8]

By 1934, several states had accepted FERA monies if not these principles, and begun worker education programs. Within months, the Washington coordinators under Smith realized that definitions of what constituted worker education varied widely. In Pennsylvania, for instance, public school buildings were made available for traditional night school courses in English, math, and history. In Oregon and California, however, worker education classes met in union halls, unused factories and private clubrooms, and under more liberal definitions of education unemployed workers took courses on the NRA codes or minimum wage legislation in European countries.[9]

By 1937 the Workers' Education Projects of the FERA had been reorganized and renamed the Workers' Service Program of the Works Progress Administration. Under the FERA, only state education departments or supervisors could sponsor worker education classes. State school officials, in turn delegated authority to local school superintendents or school boards. Only those classified as out of work teachers by state relief offices could be assigned to worker education projects. The Workers' Service instituted more flexible rules. Any state agency could sponsor workers' education, and the definition of "teacher" widened considerably. Under the re-organized WPA system, writers, artist, musicians, librarians, lawyers, and many others qualified to teach in worker education classes. They had to qualify for relief but they did not have to have teacher certificates or any proof of prior teaching experience.[10]

No one specific project stands as an accurate model of the federal

worker education program under the FERA and WPA. The fragile system of negotiation and cooperation between federal, state, and local officials supported variety rather than conformity to one plan. Still, a closer look at one worker education program in detail illustrates some of the problems and weaknesses which faced the whole program as well as some of the achievements shared by many. Between 1934 and 1937 systems of resident schools and camps for unemployed women functioned within the FERA and WPA structures as emergency worker education projects. First administered under FERA, by 1935 the schools had become a relief program administered by the National Youth Administration. Hilda Smith, as Specialist in Workers' Education, coordinated the attempt to have schools for unemployed women scattered throughout the nation until 1935. After the NYA received authority from the WPA to establish a Division on Educational Camps, Dorothea deSchweinitz directed the program, although Hilda Smith continued to chair an advisory committee on problems connected with worker education.[11]

Hilda Smith, arguing for worker education programs specifically aimed at women workers, declared that education, just as much as food, shelter, and clothing, was a genuine relief need. If women workers were to be "socially responsible" citizens they must be able to read, write, and understand economic principles.[12] Responding to her pleas, Harry Hopkins authorized funds. From 1934-1937 methods of administration changed, but the worker education camps for women, whether under the FERA or NYA, retained sufficient similarities to be considered a single experiment.

During the spring and summer of each year between 1934 and 1937 an average of twenty-eight government "educational camps" gave approximately 2,000 unemployed women an opportunity to enroll in classes, to acquire medical care as well as food and shelter, and to earn small stipends through participation in government work projects such as making hospital supplies, binding Braille books for the blind, stringing tennis rackets, or typing pamphlets for state departments of education.[13] Federal grants provided salaries for teachers, payments for the student efforts on work projects, maintenance and upkeep of buildings. State and private funds generally paid for equipment and building rentals. States provided facilities in borrowed college campuses, YWCA or Girl Scout camps, or, in a few cases, large private homes.

Among the educational camps' achievements simple relief was the most important. Most camps operated for periods of less than three months — too little time for any kind of sophisticated vocational training. They all provided the chance for decent meals and secure lodgings to unemployed women, some of whom were so exhausted and anxious as to be "on the brink of suicide."[15] Although one FERA camp accepted women workers over age 35, young women in their teens or early twenties attended most of the education camps. By 1936, women from age 15-24 comprised over forty percent of the 1,700,000 women said to be totally unemployed.[16] Obviously the camps only dented the surface of

need among this group, but for the few thousand a summer who arrived at places with names like Camp Eleanor and Camp Seeley the chance existed not only for adequate food and rest but also for a variety of classes. Hilda Smith, who toured twelve camps in 1934, compiled a folder of excerpts from letters written by worker-students. "I can't be thankful enough," wrote one southern mill worker. "It's not only that I'm getting enough to eat for the first time in three years, but I begin to think of myself as a real person." Another worker, an unemployed cook, wrote "It seemed like someone did have an interest in whether we lived or starved." An out of work weaver contributed, "I have had very little education, so that the school brought much of value to my life."[17]

Most of the young women coming to the educational camps faced serious medical and dental problems, frequently brought on by years of neglect. Most were significantly underweight. Approximately half the students who needed medical care received it, often through barter agreements with local doctors and hospitals. In one Oklahoma school, for instance, worker students mended hospital sheets and towels in exchange for needed surgery for their fellow students.[18]

Clearly the schools met basic and critical needs for better nutrition and medical care. One teacher at a NYA camp kept a journal she labeled, "Heartbreak House." Brought up on private summer camp traditions she was at first bewildered when the worker students politely refused to sing in the dining room. Only gradually did she come to realize that ". . . singing marred the flavor of corn bread dripping in butter and the crackle of bacon and made questionable the assurance of a second helping."[19]

Students at the schools gained weight, visited physicians, had rotten teeth pulled. Moreover, thousands of young women had the chance to act their real ages, freed at least for a few weeks from the burdens of providing for aged relatives or tramping the streets looking for work. The camp newspaper put out by the residents of Camp Eleanor, held at Rutherford College, North Carolina detailed the hijinks of young women enjoying each other's company. *News You're After*, a mimeographed bulletin put out every two weeks by Camp Eleanor students, enthused about the nickelodeon installed in the gym and ran contests for "cutest girl" and "biggest flirt."[20]

Undoubtedly the camps met physical and emotional relief needs. Hilda Smith in urging worker education had listed education as a genuine relief need as well. As educational institutions, the camps were less clearly successful, though education was indeed provided as a kind of relief. The resident camps for unemployed women faced problems with funding and planning, with curriculum and teaching and with unfavorable publicity.

After receiving a maximum figure of $6,000 for sixty students from the federal government, each educational camp was on its own. State and private contributions varied widely. No uniform accounting system for the program existed. In many cases directors of the camps bought food and other items on credit from local merchants and then waited with

increasing embarrassment for checks from state relief agencies to arrive.[21] One such woman wrote to Hilda Smith to complain about red tape. With only three weeks to prepare for the arrival of students, she had purchased pencils, shorthand books, and other class supplies, only to find out later she would be denied repayment because she had not followed the proper procedures which involved getting bids from at least three sources for two gross of pencils.[22] In almost every case state and local relief officials gave final approval for establishment of schools at the very last minute, literally forcing planning in most cases to be done within a few weeks. Ethel Clark's lament that "If only we could have had three months for this job of setting up camps and centers instead of a few days, we would have had quite a different story to tell," echoes through the final reports camp supervisors sent to Washington.[23] The haphazard planning almost guaranteed that many of the teachers and students would be confused about the goals of the program. A 1937 NYA survery revealed that over half of the women questioned were under the mistaken impression that the government would find them jobs after their attendance at the education camps. "What good does a government school do if you can't get a job?" one student scribbled in the margins of her questionnaire.[24]

Haphazard planning and the status of the program as a relief project also contributed to problems with curriculum and teaching. With no master plan, the schools functioned month-to-month without any standard curriculum, or even much communication between school directors about which kinds of teaching methods worked best. Many educational camps offered courses in cooking, housekeeping, typing and stenography. In keeping with the private worker-education tradition, almost all offered courses in economics and English.

Although numerous examples of gifted teachers and experienced camp directors existed, the role of the camps as relief programs demanded that the teachers chosen be taken from relief rolls. Often state and local officials chose teachers by a seniority system, whereby those listed longest at relief offices got the job, regardless of skill, regardless of familiarity with worker education principles. Georgia did choose its teachers from lists of Georgians who had completed a special course devised by Hilda Smith to familiarize teachers with worker education, but most states did not.[25] Especially after the NYA adopted the more liberal WPA Workers' Service guidelines which allowed the hiring of persons without formal teacher training the level of teaching skill within the program varied. Incompetents did get jobs. The student who indignantly wrote that she knew as much as her Social Studies teacher might have been right.[27] Moreover, the failure of most states to pay teachers the $25 per month recommended by WPA guidelines may have encouraged the brightest and most able of the unemployed teachers on relief rolls to take other jobs if offered. Even given their very brief terms of a few month's duration, many schools experienced turnover in their teaching staffs.[28]

Of course, teachers often faced classes of young women poorly prepared for any kind of academic class. Students too had to be eligible for relief. According to guidelines established by the Workers' Education office in Washington, "interest in education" was to be an essential requirement for admission. Often, however, state and local relief officials bowed to a more cruel reality. Rather than choose women workers who showed the most promise of benefiting from several months of education, relief administrators frequently chose those who seemed most seriously malnourished or ill, regardless of their physical or mental capability of doing the work of the school.[29]

Unfavorable publicity and an atmosphere of confrontation also clouded the effectiveness of the resident camps and schools for unemployed women. The emphasis on current affairs and the study of economics often led to free-ranging discussions in camp classes about the causes of unemployment and the nature of the American business structure. Not only officials from the Girl Scout and YWCA Councils which had rented or donated camp facilities but also members of local school boards were frequent visitors. They sometimes left unhappy about the controversial nature of class speeches and the open pro-union bias of many teachers and students. Mary Anderson, Director of the Women's Bureau of the United States Department of Labor and a member of the National Advisory Committee for the schools reported confrontations, even shouting matches, between local school boards and the NYA schools.[30] Hilda Smith fretted that members of institutions which had loaned buildings "watched suspiciously every slightest action of the girls in the (NYA-FERA) schools."[31] Red-baiting articles began to circulate in newspapers charging that the schools encouraged the acceptance of Communism.[32] State education officials and local school boards publicly denounced the women-worker camps' supposed advocacy of radicalism, in most cases a charge stemming from little more than a director's or teacher's unwillingness to demand "my country right or wrong partriotism" from students. They worried that the pro-unionism which was indeed present in many camps meant public subsidy for labor activism. Finally they challenged the NYA as a federal intrusion into state control of education. The residents of camps for women workers were but a small part of the NYA system and defunct by 1937, but as NYA "educational projects," they too faced hostile scrutiny from educators who saw the NYA as a "formidable rival of the nation's schools . . . luring away pupils."[33] By 1941 the controversy exploded at a national convention of the American Association of School Administrators. The educators charged that President Franklin Roosevelt spent money for almost every other social purpose but had never recommended direct federal aid to schools and concluded the "President is not enthusiastic about the established school system."[34] *Time* magazine, reporting the convention, summarized the schoolmen's charges when it discussed federal involvement in education through the NYA and other agencies as a "revolution."[35]

Problems with planning, teaching, and public controversy plagued the entire New Deal worker education experiment and indeed helped doom its chances of becoming a permanent, federally subsidized form of special education. In important ways the achievements and failures of the example singled out here, the resident camps for unemployed women, paralleled the achievements and failures of the entire program. Workers' education statistics often were buried within masses of figures on the entire emergency education program and difficult to recover with complete accuracy. The best estimates indicate that between 1933-1942 thirty-six states conducted worker education activities, seventeen of them continuously since the first year. During the peak years of 1936 and 1937 approximately two thousand teachers received worker education jobs annually. Probably over a million workers sat in some kind of government-sponsored class. As defense industries developed and war loomed, WPA resources predictably dwindled. By June 1942 when war work subsumed the program, only ten states still continued skeletal worker education projects.[36]

Despite the fact that it existed for a decade and affected huge numbers of people, government-sponsored worker education always existed as an emergency education program, not a long-range plan. Haphazard planning naturally followed when teachers received only short term assignments, usually for three months, with wages very often dependent on available funds. Informed about the availability of classes by their unions, school officials, relief workers, even their friends, workers often arrived at classes confused, to be greeted by equally confused teachers. "The more I see of teachers, the more I think about training," commented one school supervisor.[37]

Hilda Smith, the workers' education specialist, did attempt to remedy some of the problems caused by poor teacher preparation. She convinced Harry Hopkins to allocate special funds for the training of workers' education teachers, and a plan drawn up by the Washington Emergency Education staff established a system of forty-five training centers scattered throughout the country. By 1935, over half of the teachers assigned to worker education projects were able to attend a six week course at one of the centers, usually located in donated space on a college campus. The training helped but did not solve all the teaching problems associated with worker education. At least several thousand persons, many of whom, after 1937, were not experienced teachers received no worker education training before showing up in their classrooms. They all had to qualify for relief. They all did not have to be committed to the principles of worker education outlined by Hilda Smith in 1933, and in fact many apparently were not.[38] The entire worker education program, not just the resident camps for unemployed women, generated public controversy. Local school boards objected to "class education" and expressed alarm at the thought of controversial questions discussed in the classroom.[39]

The problems government sponsored worker education faced are easy to identify. Education as a form of emergency relief meant education in which adequate teacher preparation and careful course planning often

became secondary to the financial and political exigencies of relief bureaucracies subject to many pressures. The achievements are harder to measure. Certainly, as was the case with the resident camps for women, the opportunity for teachers to find jobs, for students to get education and often a stipend for part-time relief jobs was a major, if short term, achievement. Never before had such large numbers of workers received a chance for additional schooling, however flawed it might have been. Many worker-education teachers found their way into the education departments of trade unions. Others went back to public schools with a new perspective on workers and economic issues. Many localities accepted people from trade unions more willingly as members of school boards, and public school classes in current affairs and the social consequences of economic policies became far more common.[40] At the very least, the worker education program verified Hilda Smith's argument that education could exist as a form of relief. Given the experimental nature of the program and the difficulties inherent in the administration of any vast relief system, its troubled history and only partial success were almost predictable.

Notes

[1] "The Workers' Education Project of the FERA and the Workers' Service Program of the WPA, 1933-1943," typescript May, 1956, pp. 3-10, Bx. 3, Hilda Smith papers, Arthur and Elizabeth Schlesinger Library on the History of Women in America, Radcliffe College, Cambridge, Mass. (Hereafter Smith, 1956 Report, SL.)

[2] Memo: Purposes and Scope of Workers' Education, February, 1937, typescript. The Records of the Works Progress Administration and its predecessors, (R.G. 69) Emergency Education Program Subject Series 1937, The National Archives, Washington, D.C. (Hereafter WPA, NA.)

[3] Memo: States compiled by Hilda Smith, February-March, 1937, typescripts, WPA, NA.

[4] See: Florence Schneider, *Patterns of Workers Education: The Story of the Bryn Mawr Summer School*, (Washington: American Council on Public Affairs, 1941); Spencer Miller, "Summer School for Workers," *American Federationist*, 32 (July, 1925): pp. 569-571; Orlie Pell, "A Workers' School for the Office Workers," *American Federationist*, 42 (June, 1935): pp. 622-624; Hilda Smith, "Bryn Mawr Summer School of 1927," *American Federationist*, 43 (October, 1927): pp. 1217-1223.

[5] *Information Regarding Workers' Education and the Affiliated Schools*, typed report, dated March 16, 1937, WPA, NA.

[6] Virginia Schieffelin to the editor of the New York *Herald Tribune*, June 7, 1935: clipping in Mary Van Kleeck Papers, Bx. 6, Sophia Smith Collection, Smith College, Northampton, Mass. (hereafter SS). The Van Kleeck Papers provide a wealth of documentation about the dispute between the Bryn Mawr Summer School at the college's Board of Directors, esp. Bx. 6, SS.

[7] Hilda Smith outlined her background in a letter to Edith Stein — Smith to Stein — March 31, 1936, Emergency Education Program, Subject Series 1935-1936, WPA, NA.

[8] Smith, 1936 Report, p. 3.

[9] Memo: "Cooperation Among Federal Departments for Worker Education," September 10, 1937, #322, Emergency Education Program, Subject Series 1936, WPA, NA.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Memo: Dorothea deSchweinitz to Mary Anderson, December 2, 1936, Secretary's File, Bx. 1280, The Records of the Women's Bureau, R.G. 86, The National Archives, Washington, D.C. (Hereafter WB, NA).

[12] "Report on Resident Schools and Camps for Unemployed Women," Office of the Specialist in Workers' Education, Federal Emergency Relief Administration, (Typescript) April, 1935, p. 8, Bx. 3, Hilda Smith Papers, SL. (Hereafter Smith, 1935 Report).

[13] Ibid; Smith, 1936 Report, pp. 1-8.

[14] Smith, 1935 Report, Plan Report Summary, unpaged.

[15] Ibid, p. 3.

[16] "The Women's Bureau Looks at Young Women and their Jobs," Speech Transcript, delivered by Mary Anderson, at NYA Girls' Projects Conference, Albany Hotel, Denver, Colorado, November 30, 1936, WB, NA.

[17] Smith, 1935 Report, pp. 5-6.

[18] Ibid, p. 27.

[19] "Heartbreak House," typescript, unpaged, anonymous journal, copy found in Hilda Smith papers, SL.

[20] Camp Publications copy, Camp Eleanor, Rutherford College, N.C., Office of Deputy Administrator, NYA State Publications, North Carolina, Records of the National Youth Administration, RG 119, The National Archives, Washington, D.C. (Hereafter NYA, NA).

[21] Smith, 1935 Report, p. 20.

[22] Ibid, p. 21.

[23] Ethel Clark to Helen Hessman, September 15, 1935, copy of letter in Hilda Smith papers, Bx. 31, SL.

[24] Description of Registrants and Staff in the Educational Camps for Unemployed Young Women of the National Youth Administration questionnaire, dated June 1, 1937, NYA Series 321, Bx. 576, NYA, NA. (Hereafter NYA survey).

[25] Ibid.

[26] Smith, 1935 Report, p. 15.

[27] Ibid.

[28] NYA Survey, pp. 8-12.

[29] Smith, 1936 Report, p. 15.

[30] Mary Anderson, Report to the Secretary from Mary Anderson, December 4, 1936, Bx. 1280, "Secretary's File," WB, NA.

[31] Smith, 1935 Report, p. 24.

[32] See, for instance, an article in the Seattle *Intelligencer*, February 23, 1936 which falsely charged that camps in Georgia trained women workers to be Communist infiltrators in factories.

[33] See "Report on Activities," National Youth Administration, Information Service, Series 330, March 15, 1941, NYA, NA.

[34] Ibid.

[35] *Time* Magazine, March 10, 1941, p. 69.

[36] Smith, 1956 Report, pp. 10-11.

[37] Ibid, p. 5.

[38] Ibid.

[39] "Labor Education: A Summary and a Forecast," typescript prepared by National Committee for the Extension of Labor Education, dated 1947, in Hilda Smith papers, SL.

[40] Smith, 1956 Report, p. 11.

12

Beyond the Prosser Resolution: Another Look at Life Adjustment Education

Richard Ognibene
The College of Saint Rose, Albany

From 1945 until 1953 the idea of education for life adjustment was an important part of the discussion about the purpose and program of American education. Life adjustment education was described in several full length texts and in hundreds of articles in practitioner oriented journals, and was the topical theme of numerous national education conferences and of workshops and meetings at the state and local level. It was also the focus of the work of twenty-nine state organized education committees and two national commissions.[1] Our knowledge of this movement is limited, however, because historians who write about twentieth century American education either omit or only briefly mention it, and because we assume perhaps that the devastating critiques of life adjustment by Bestor and Hofstadter have addressed the topic sufficiently.[2] There is a tendency to dismiss life adjustment education too easily, as Cremin did when he concluded that it was a "victim of its own ill-chosen name," or to analyze it too narrowly, as Kliebard did when he characterized the life adjustment movement as an "interesting episode in the development of the social-efficiency rationale for curriculum reform."[3]

This paper cannot resolve all these issues. Instead, the effort will be made to delineate several aspects of the life adjustment education movement, to formulate some questions suggested by the sources examined thus far, and to propose a future research agenda based on those questions. An additional purpose is to suggest that our knowledge of this movement is limited, and to imply that these limitations affect our ability to judge the complexity of several past and present educational developments. To achieve these goals and to remedy these differences, the paper will explore four aspects of the life adjustment education movement: (1) the effort to create a national campaign; (2) its impact on curriculum; (3) the creation of new roles for guidance counselors; and (4) its influence on Catholic education.

The Campaign for Life Adjustment

Although conditions had been right for several years, life adjustment education was conceived on June 1, 1945, the result of a resolution offered by Charles Prosser at a conference for vocational educators held in Washington, D.C. In this resolution, Prosser argued that the schools could prepare effectively the 20 percent of the students who entered college, and the 20 percent who entered skilled occupations, but, the resolution continued,

> We do not believe that the remaining 60 percent of our youth of secondary

school age will receive the life adjustment training they need and to which they are entitled as American citizens — unless and until the administrators of public education with the assistance of the vocational education leaders formulate a comparable program for this group.[4]

The resolution went on to call for conferences to address the problem and to develop such a program. The Commissioner of Education accepted this proposal, with the result that regional conferences were held in 1946 in New York, Chicago, Cheyenne, Sacramento, and Birmingham. These conferences confirmed the sentiment that secondary schools failed a majority of students, and suggested that the failure could be reversed through functional, experienced based curricula, expanded guidance, supervised work experiences, and the wholehearted support of this approach by teachers and the community. The next step was a national conference held in Chicago in May, 1947, to develop practical action plans to achieve the acceptance of these ideas in the schools. Prosser was also present at this conference, and closed the meeting with this rather dramatic exhortation:

> Never was there such a meeting where people were so sincere in their belief that this was the golden opportunity to do something that would give to *all* American youth their educational heritage so long denied. What you have planned is worth fighting for — it is worth dying for. . . .
>
> I am proud to have lived long enough to see my fellow schoolmen design a plan which will aid in achieving for every youth an education truly adjusted to life . . . Yes, it is a dream — man's big dream . . . That you will bring its realization into the bright light of today and tomorrow I have no doubt. God bless you all"[5]

In the two years since the already famous Prosser Resolution, the concept of life adjustment education for the "neglected 60 percent" had evolved into a program for all youth. Moreover, the means to achieve this program was to be a National Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth. This approach was proposed at the Chicago conference, was accepted by the Commissioner of Education, and implemented by December, 1947.

The Commission was made up of nine members representing the following organizations: (1) American Association of School Administrators; (2) American Association of Junior Colleges; (3) American Vocational Association; (4) National Association of High-School Supervisors and Directors of Secondary Education; (5) National Association of State Directors for Vocational Education; (7) National Catholic Welfare Conference; (8) National Council of Chief State School Officers; and (9), the National Education Association. Among the Commission's early accomplishments was the formulation of a definition of life adjustment education that was subsequently used by most people associated with this movement:

> Life adjustment education is designed to equip all American youth to live democratically with satisfaction to themselves and profit to society as

> home members, workers, and citizens. It is concerned especially with a sizable proportion of youth of high-school age (both in school and out) whose objectives are less well served by our schools than the objectives of preparation for either a skilled occupation or higher education.[6]

Rather definitively, the Commission elevated three elements of one's life experiences as most worthy of attention and education for everyone, but "especially" wanting it for a large and less intellectually able group of students.

Commission members and support staff from the Office of Education took an activist role in promoting life adjustment education. They spoke at conferences, wrote articles and other descriptive materials, and served as regional national consultants. They were, in the words of their chair, Benjamin Willis, Yonkers Superintendent, "attempting to stimulate the mobilization of educational forces on a broad front for a persistent and continued attack on the problems of secondary education."[7] Both the tone and the specific language of the writings of the Office of Education staff indicate the fervor of their commitment; they were, in short, engaged in a monumental "campaign."[8] Staff members were enthusiastic and productive. Everywhere one looks one finds speeches, articles, and chapters by the same people: J. Dan Hull; Galen Jones; Walter Gaumnitz; and Raymond Gregory. Contemporaries observed that life adjustment supporters were engaged in a "crusade," and indeed the 1947 Prosser speech cited above sounded like the beginning of a holy war.[9]

The organizational strategy adopted by the Commission had two components. First, the commission determined that it would work through state departments of education to identify and assist specific cooperating schools that established life adjustment programs. To assist schools in meeting the criteria to become a cooperating school, the Commission also established connections to national professional associations and to teacher training institutions. By 1950, twenty states had established or designated committees to work with the Commission, and nine additional states joined that group during the existence of the Second Life Adjustment Commission (1950-1953). The second part of the strategy was to collect and publicize information about schools that developed life adjustment programs, to create, in other words, a supportive network of institutions involved in a common cause.[10]

From the beginning the Office of Education created what could be characterized as a "cookbook approach" to establishing life adjustment education. Their 1949 pamphlets "Getting State Programs of Life Adjustment Under Way," and "Developing Life Adjustment Education in a Local School" initiated a series of "how to" speeches and articles that provided information that was quite detailed and often trivial.[11] Life adjustment education was to be a local undertaking, but the basic principles of democratic leadership, school wide planning, experienced based curricula, an enhanced role for guidance, the appropriate use of consul-

tants, and increased community support, were consistently advocated.

There were two aspects of the campaign to establish life adjustment education that deserve more attention. The first is that this movement represented a shift toward a more generalized form of vocational training in contrast to the more specific purposes of vocational education established by the Smith-Hughes Act. Life adjustment education was designed to equip all youth to live a satisfactory life as workers. An early "common understanding" among life adjustment educators was the statement in the movement's first major publication (1948) that "life adjustment is impossible unless occupational adjustment occurs."[12] The *Report of the First Commission on Life Adjustment* was to the point when it asserted that "all pupils can profit by work experience."[13] Given Charles Prosser's authorship of the Smith-Hughes Act, and given his role as the inspirational founder of life adjustment education, the connection seems obvious. Yet a recent, extensive, study on vocationalism in America does not mention life adjustment even once.[14] This omission seems inappropriate given the view of life adjustment education expressed by the Assistant Commissioner for Vocational Education in 1951:

> Without fear of contradiction, it can be said that the ideas and the ideals . . . in the Prosser Resolution have taken a hold upon the hearts and minds of leaders in education throughout . . . this country and that we are now on the verge of a movement in secondary education that may be the most profound that has taken place since the inauguration of vocational education under the provisions of the National Vocational Education Acts.[15]

In its modern form general vocational education is called career education, yet insufficient attention has been paid to the movement that helped bring this contemporary trend into existence.

A second aspect of the campaign for life adjustment that seems noteworthy is that this movement was the first of the series of federal educational policy initiatives begun after World War II. A strategy was devised to reach the nation's schools through the fervid and prolific pens of federal education officials, by the omnipresence of those same officials at national and regional professional meetings, and through the creation of strategic alliances with state educational leaders. If this process sounds familiar it is because it is identical to the pattern followed by the federal education officers in the 1970's in both the career education and mainstreaming movements and is continuing today on behalf of excellence in education. This similarity suggests that the life adjustment movement could provide excellent material for a case study on the recently developed leadership role of the federal government in educational affairs.

Life Adjustment Curriculum

While many descriptions of life adjustment education's basic principles were developed, the most succint yet complete analysis listed seven criteria for evaluating life adjustment programs. According to this list, such programs

1. respect individual worth and personality
2. seek to enroll and retain all youth
3. provide common learning experiences organized around the problems of living
4. emphasize direct experiences
5. provide democratic planning, organization, operation, and planning
6. make constructive use of records and data
7. provide for evaluation in terms of desirable changes in pupil behavior[16]

Although each criterion is important for understanding of some aspect of life adjustment education, the phrases "common learning experience," "problems of living" and "direct experience" are the most germane to an understanding of life adjustment curriculum development. Virtually no life adjustment supporter felt the need to justify or theorize about these concepts; they existed, as Cremin noted, as part of the conventional wisdom accessible to all 20th century progressive educators.[17] Indeed, in explaining that life adjustment education would be an *action* rather than theory oriented movement, the *Report of the First Commission on Life Adjustment Education* devoted nearly 20 percent of its total narrative to the history of recent demands for functional, general education, and focused particular attention on the Seven Cardinal Principles, New Deal youth programs, and the series of pronouncements of the Educational Policies Commission.[18] Life adjustment educators were keenly aware of the progressive experimentation that had taken place in the 1930's and felt that they were simply carrying on that tradition.[19] Prosser stated the argument quite clearly: "some progress has been made in curriculum development, [but] little reform will be accomplished unless and until the subject matter of high school becomes functioning subject matter for life."[20]

Life adjustment educators sought to orient all curriculum to real life problems and to reorganize every course so that it contributed to the life adjustment of all students.[21] They recognized, however, that several "roadblocks" existed that inhibited the achievement of this goal, most notably, the resistance of traditional subject matter teachers. By articulating the nature of these roadblocks, and by asserting their belief in the correctness and the increasing acceptability of the life adjustment philosophy, life adjustment supporters hoped to overcome these barriers.[22]

An alternative to the total life adjustment approach that was more successfully introduced into schools was the establishment of a common learnings or core curriculum course most often taught at the junior high school level. It was in the core course, often created by combining the former English and Social Studies offering, that the major effort was made to achieve the citizenship goals of life adjustment education. These courses emphasized human relations, group building activities, personal problems in a social setting, and knowledge of an involvement in the community.[23] A widely known series of junior high booklets published

by Science Research Associates provided content resources for the core. Booklet titles like *You and Your Problems, Let's Talk About Honesty, Clubs are Fun, How to Get Along With Others, Exploring Your Community,* and *Citizenship for Boys and Girls,* illustrate the intended outcomes of a common learnings course. When questioned about the danger of replacing traditional disciplines with student problems as the basis of curriculum, one member of the Life Adjustment Commission responded as follows:

> Many in the teaching profession fear that youth's problems may be trivial therefore not as important as subjects now organized. These doubts are expelled, however, when faith is established in the ability of the teacher to guide the learning process for youth.[24]

This is a non-answer, but it does remind us that when engaged in a holy war of any kind, leaders always ask followers to have faith.

As noted earlier, education as a preparation for work was a key life adjustment objective, one that had several curriculum consequences. One was an increased emphasis on Business Education and on the claim that some of its content like typing and bookkeeping was essential for all students.[25] A second consequence was the development of special courses, or units in high school core courses, with titles like "The Problems of Making a Living" and "How to Get a Job and Hold It."[26] Among the Science Research Associates booklets for senior high students were several that pertained to this area: for example, *Our World of Work; What Employers Want;* and *Getting Job Experience.* I cannot resist noting that this last booklet contains a two-page section on "proper employer-employee relationships" written in the form of six maxims with explanatory paragraphs under each one. The first maxim was THE BOSS IS ALWAYS RIGHT — OR NEARLY ALWAYS, and the second was A LITTLE APPLE POLISHING.[27] I will resist commenting on this since a critique of life adjustment obviously requires a whole other paper, perhaps several.

A third significant way in which life adjustment educators sought to prepare students for employment was through an enthusiastic endorsement of school-work programs. With the detail characteristic of many life adjustment written sources, two authors who developed a chapter on this topic suggested six benefits to the student and seven for the school and community when properly organized school-work programs exist. Properly organized here means creating an advisory committee, providing a coordinator, and establishing a placement service. "The time [was] long overdue" these experts concluded, "when our schools must extend this phase of life adjustment to every youth."[28]

Life adjustment education sought to prepare youth to live appropriately as citizens, workers, and home members, and this last area also made claims for a more honored space in the curriculum. Home economics in general and specific courses in home family living were major beneficiaries of life adjustment education. Appropriately so, argued one

team of home economists, because there was no area "more urgent than the need for sound, practical education for home and family living, since in a democracy the family 'holds the first place as the creator and guardian of human values.'"[29] Even more seriously, others argued that this area was important because to deny youth the knowledge they needed for home living was "to jeopardize unduly our national security."[30] This assertion may be tempered by the reality of a two-page life adjustment homemaking article in which one learns that (1) it is permissible to allow students to adjust recipes to fit the size of their families; (2) setting an attractive table when you live in a trailer requires extra thought; and that (3) requiring handmade buttonholes when machine made ones are perfectly acceptable is old fashioned.[31] Whether these are genuinely national security issues is a matter of opinion, or perhaps judgment.

To reexamine the influence of the life adjustment movement on curriculum is relevant because that influence is still very present. Because the 1950's ended with Conant's *The American High School Today* and with the Woods Hole Conference chaired by Jerome Bruner, the tendency exists to view life adjustment as a movement that was overpowered by the intellectual critics of the decade, and that the only lasting curriculum change of the period was the one identified with the notions of structure, readiness, intuition, and inquiry. We know now that such an assumption is incorrect. An analysis of 6000 high school transcripts for the period 1964-1980 done for the National Commission on Excellence in Education shows that students have migrated from college preparation and vocational programs to general track programs in large numbers. The proportion of students in general programs of study is up from 12 percent in 1964 to 42 percent in 1979. Twenty-five percent of the credits earned by general track students are in physical and health education, schoolwork programs, remedial courses, and personal service courses such as driver education and training for adulthood and marriage.[32] In an analysis of American education done a few years ago, Fred and Grace Hechinger wrote that "no one [educational] movement has ever swept the country; no earlier reform ever disappears completely."[33] If this is correct, as it appears to be, there must be some wisdom to be gained from a more careful analysis of the earlier battle between the disciplines and the needs of everyday life. If the nation is at risk, merely to engage in yet another rhetorical war over education will not do much to minimize the danger.

As a scholarly issue, further study of life adjustment curriculum is encouraged by the suggestions made by Kliebard and Franklin in their recent analysis of the history of curriculum.[34] There are social control aspects to life adjustment that are obvious; equally obvious are the passionate and well intentioned efforts of the school people who were so easily coaxed into writing the "how we did it back home" materials on the making of good citizens, workers, and home members. The interplay between these two motivating forces must be the real story behind life adjustment education. Moreover, that story can be found in schools and offices in what must be an enormous array of uncatalogued and dispersed

material. This research seems challenging and needed.

Guidance and Life Adjustment

One of the major purposes of life adjustment education was to enroll, retain, and graduate a higher proportion of high school students, or as it was called at the time, to increase the "holding power" of schools. Given that objective, and given the seven life adjustment criteria listed earlier, it is not surprising that guidance was given a central role in most life adjustment discussions. Life adjustment was "essentially a counseling viewpoint and its acceptance by a school [meant] that the entire program of that school must be developed around the guidance of individual students."[35] Life adjustment materials described guidance as the "keystone" of the program. Guidance counselors were to undertake the student and community studies that made relevant curriculum development possible. Guidance was no longer to be a single faceted mechanistic activity, rather, it was defined as "the high art of helping boys and girls plan their own actions wisely."[36]

The implications of this perspective were several: schools without guidance counselors should get some; inadequate counseling departments should be expanded; and the activities and methods of counselors would and should be different from those of an earlier period.[37]

To members of the guidance profession, this new conception of guidance by life adjustment educators is either unknown or underappreciated. Instead, virtually all the credit for the historic shift from vocational guidance to a counseling model is given to Carl Rogers, and for the expansion of school guidance generally to the recommendations of James Conant.[38] A review of life adjustment literature suggests that this assessment is inadequate.

The guidance profession has been and remains engaged in a serious debate about the nature of the primary services it offers, and about the means to defend against legislators who desire to save money by reducing services and against school personnel who assign them inappropriate tasks. The profession itself has been uncertain about the role it wants to play, sometimes emphasizing personal counseling and other times finding career education work preferable.[39] A solution to this dilemma is a recent proposal to recast the role of counselor as curriculum developer, teacher, and researcher; in short to recreate a role for guidance like that articulated by life adjustment educators.[40] It seems clear that an historical analysis of life adjustment education and guidance could be useful to guidance personnel engaged in a debate about the nature of their profession, and that it is an appropriate task for historians to try to shed light on problem areas in the world of educational practice.

Life Adjustment and Catholic Education

Historians of the Catholic school movement have been interested

primarily in studying the motivations, disputes, and cultural characteristics that produced parochial school systems. As a result, studies about what went on in the schools are as much needed here as they are in the study of public education. My hunch is that historical investigations into this area would reveal an almost exaggerated concern with the mastery of academic disciplines in Catholic schools. This is in part due to the traditions and European origins of the nineteenth century teaching orders that originally staffed many of these schools, and because Catholic school founders in their search for acceptance and support were determined to prove that these schools were more moral, patriotic, and academic than any others.[41]

The academic emphasis carried over to the twentieth century Catholic secondary school movement. Catholic high schools tended to be moderately selective, to emphasize college preparatory programs almost to the exclusion of others, and to view other types of programs and courses disparagingly. These characteristics are considerably less true today than they were, a condition that is the result of a number of factors including ecumenism, changes in the social class status of Catholics, and trends in urban history over which church and school leaders had no control. There is evidence, however, that changing views of educational purposes and pedagogy began with the surprising and enthusiastic acceptance of life adjustment education by a large number of Catholic school officials. This is a surprise because life adjustment education was devoid of any religious or spiritual dimensions.

Catholics were represented in life adjustment activities from the beginning. The National Catholic Welfare Conference was one of the nine organizations represented on the First Life Adjustment Commission. Sister Mary Janet, a member of a Catholic University based organization dedicated to social improvement (Commission on American Citizenship), was the Catholic representative on both the First and Second Life Adjustment Commissions. The First Commission held three national conferences. At their first conference in 1948, there was only one Catholic school representative; at the third conference in 1950, where the decision was made to recommend the creation of a Second National Life Adjustment Commission, one sixth of the participants were Catholic school educators.[42] During the 1949-1950 school year only a handful of dioceses were investigating life adjustment curricula, but by 1954, thirty-four dioceses and the District of Columbia reported school based life adjustment activities.[43] Among the more notable developments were: (1) a Christian family living curriculum developed by the Presentation Sisters in San Francisco that was widely known and often cited in general life adjustment literature; (2) a secondary core curriculum that was developed as a pilot program at Archbishop Williams High School in Braintree, Massachusetts; and (3) a diocesan wide inservice program in Milwaukee.[44]

Catholic involvement in life adjustment education turned out to be a relatively uncomplicated intellectual choice. There was nothing objectionable in life adjustment ideas and Catholic school personnel found the

emphasis on individual worth and dignity in perfect harmony with the Christian tradition. In fact, Catholic life adjustment enthusiasts argued that life adjustment education would require Catholic teachers to treat students according to Christian principles, principles that had often given way in the past to the interpersonal requirements of a very formal pedagogical system. As the Milwaukee superintendent Monsignor Goebel suggested, the life adjustment program became "the medium for transmission of our Christian inheritance."[45] Catholics adapted life adjustment education to meet their needs, mostly by adding to it elements that seemed missing. Sister Mary Janet's conception of life adjustment published in a secular journal went beyond the definition used by school persons in the public sector:

> Education for human living should be cooperative activity of pupil, home, school, church, and community by means of which youth gain knowledge and skills and apply these to life problems; by which they are led to respect their fellow men; to share their personal gifts and resources of the earth according to the plan of God, to work with dignity, to live in unity. This, I believe, is life adjustment.[46]

Catholic participation in life adjustment education may have been a small turning point in the history of American education. Life adjustment brought public and Catholic school educators together intellectually and through joint participation in a number of projects in a way that had not happened before. The heritage of public and Catholic school conflict was blunted somewhat after a century of hostility and mistrust. Since the life adjustment movement, Catholic schools have joined and been welcomed into a number of efforts to solve national problems through educational means. Because of the life adjustment movement, educational pluralism, if not celebrated by all, has become more of a possibility. This outcome, and the period when it began, is worth further attention.

Lastly, life adjustment opened the door to participation by Catholic educators in various innovative pedagogical movements. Indeed, once begun, Catholic educators have often gone farther or faster in classroom and school wide experimentation than their public school counterparts. A public school-Catholic school comparison of the range and depth of life adjustment experimentation would enhance our knowledge of both systems. Exploring historical links between the two systems might promote further resolution of some still unfinished business between them.

Conclusion

This paper contends that a thorough examination of life adjustment education is warranted, and points to several specific areas that might be investigated. Its purpose was to call attention to our limited understanding of a modern educational movement, and to invite others to join in the effort to correct this deficiency.

Notes

[1] Office of Education, *A Look Ahead in Secondary Education: Report of the Second Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youth*. Washington, 1954, 1-7.

[2] Arthur Bestor, *Educational Wastelands*. Urbana, 1953, Chapter 6; Richard Hofstadter, *Anti Intellectualism in American Life*. New York, 1962, Chapter 13.

[3] Lawrence Cremin, *The Transformation of the School*. New York, 1961, 338; Herbert Kliebard, "The Drive for Curriculum Change in the United States 1890-1958: II — From Local Reform to a National Preoccupation," *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 11 (Oct.-Dec., 1979), 284.

[4] Federal Security Agency Office of Education, *Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth*. Washington, 1948, 15.

[5] *Ibid*., 22. Italics in original.

[6] Federal Security Agency Office of Education, *Vitalizing Secondary Education: Report of the First Commission on Life Adjustment Education for Youths*. Washington, 1951, 36.

[7] Benjamin Willis, "Life Adjustment Education for Youth," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, 33 (April, 1949), 106.

[8] Walter Gaumnitz, "Life Adjustment — Seven Years After," *California Journal of Secondary Education*, 27 (Nov., 1952), 412-417.

[9] R. Lee Hornbake, "The Quest for Life-Adjustment Education," *Industrial and Vocational Education*, 39 (Jan., 1950), 1.

[10] *Vitalizing Secondary Education*, Chapter 2; and Galen Jones, "Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth," *Educational Outlook*, 24 (Jan., 1950), 64-65.

[11] Speeches by Vernon Mickell and Harl Douglas on "How Can We Develop An Effective Program of Education for Life Adjustment," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 33 (April, 1949), 153-159; Donald McIntosh, "Launching a Life Adjustment Program," *California Journal of Secondary Education*, 25 (Nov., 1950), 411-416; Glenn Varner, *et al*., "What Basic Policies are Essential in a State Wide Adjustment Education Program," and "How Do You Get a State-Wide Life Adjustment Education Program Under Way?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary School Principals*, 36 (April, 1952), 232-282; Walter Gaumnitz, *et al*., "What is the Role of the State Principals Association and Other State Professional and Lay Organizations in Promoting Life Adjustment Education?" and "What is the Role of the Principal in Promoting a Life Adjustment Education Program in His School?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, 37 (April, 1953), 281-317.

[12] *Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth*, 97.

[13] *Vitalizing Secondary Education*, 92.

[14] Harvey Kantor and David Tyack, *Work, Youth, and Schooling*, Stanford, 1982.

[15] Raymond Gregory, "The Program of Life Adjustment Education on the National Level," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, 35 (April, 1951), 172.

[16] Jones, 63-64.

[17] Cremin, 328-333.

[18] *Vitalizing Secondary Education*, 10-30.

[19] Edward Krug, *The Shaping of the American High School, 1920-1941*, Madison, 1972, Chapter 10.

[20] Charles Prosser, *Secondary Education and Life*, Cambridge, 1939, 1.

[21] Paul Jacobson, "How Can We Organize the High-School Curriculum to Serve the Life Problems of Youth," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, 34 (Jan., 1950), 209-214; and Carl Franzen, "Life Adjustment and the Four Major Objectives of Secondary Education," *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, 35 (Oct. 1951), 99-111.

[22] Walter Gaumnitz, "Roadblocks to Life Adjustment Education," *School Life*, 32 (Nov., 1949), 19-22; Richard Mumma, "The Real Barrier to a More Realistic Curriculum: The Teacher," *Educational Administration and Supervision*, 36 (Jan., 1950), 39-44; and Arthur Teele, "Roadblocks to Life Adjustment Education," *Education*, 73 (Oct., 1952), 104-107.

[23] Lloyd Michaels, *et al.*, "How Can Common Learnings, Core Curriculum, and Improved Subject Offerings Be Used in Life Adjustment Education?" *Bulletin of the National Association of Secondary-School Principals*, 36 (April, 1952), 232-251; and *Vitalizing Secondary Education*, 73-79.

[24] Paul Collier, "Problems in Life Adjustment Education," *Educational Outlook*, 24 (Jan., 1950), 69.

[25] Paul Boynton, "Business Education for Life," *American Business Education*, 10 (Oct. 1953), 17-19.

[26] *Vitalizing Secondary Education*, 91; and Bruce Allingham, "Senior Seminar for Life Adjustment," *Clearing House*, 26 (Feb., 1952), 345.

[27] Thomas Christensen, *Getting Job Experience*, Science Research Associates, Chicago, 1949, 31-32.

[28] Bernard Jordon and Harry Spencer, "Supervised Work Experience Programs in Life Adjustment Education," in Franklin Zeran, ed., *Life Adjustment in Action*, New York, 1953, 413-432.

[29] Mary Laxson and Howard Cunnings, "Education for Home and Family Living in Life Adjustment Education," *Practical Home Economics*, 30 (March, 1952), 138.

[50] *Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth*, 69.

[51] Mildred Weigly Wood, "Reconditioning Homemaking Programs," *Practical Home Economics*, 30 (May, 1952), 202-204.

[52] *A Nation at Risk*, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, 1983, 18-19; Ernest Boyer, *High School*, New York, 1983, 73-74.

[53] Fred and Grace Hechinger, *Growing Up in America*, New York, 1975, 4.

[54] Herbert Kliebard and Barry Franklin, "The Course of the Course of Study: History of Curriculum," in John Hardin Best, ed., *Historical Inquiry in Education: A Research Agenda*, American Educational Research Association, Washington, 1983, 138-157.

[55] Donald Kitch, "The Counselor's State in Life Adjustment Education," *Occupations*, 29 (March, 1951), 424.

[56] *Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth*, 56.

[57] Ramon Charles, "Guidance Services for Life Adjustment Education," in *Life Adjustment Education in Action*, 371-390; J.W. McDaniel, "Guidance for Life Adjustment," in Harl Douglas, ed., *Education for Life Adjustment*, New York, 1950, 314-331.

[58] Roger Aubrey, "Historical Development of Guidance and Counseling and Implications for the Future," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 55 (Feb., 1977), 288-295.

[59] John Eddy, *et al.*, "Strategies for Maintaining and Increasing Counselors' Use of Time for Counseling," *The School Counselor*, 30 (Nov., 1982), 122-126; Fred Dorn and Ann Schroer, "Career Counseling: An Old Friend in Need," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 61 (Jan., 1983), 265-266.

[60] Jack Martin, "Curriculum Development in School Counseling," *Personnel and Guidance Journal*, 61 (March, 1983), 406-409.

[61] This interpretation is borne out by an examination of the noted Catholic school leader, Bernard McQuaid, Bishop of Rochester, New York. See Frederick Zweifein, *Life and Letters of Bishop McQuaid*, 3 vols., Rochester, N.Y., 1925-1927.

[62] Sister Mary Janet, "The Future of Life Adjustment Education," *National Catholic Educational Association Bulletin*, 47 (Nov., 1950), 11.

[63] *Vitalizing Secondary Education*, 58-59; *A Look Ahead in Secondary Education*, 50.

[64] Willis, 99; J. Dan Hull, "Planning Learning for Life Adjustment," *Proceedings of the Middle State Council for the Social Studies*, 1949-1950, 30-31; Sister Virginia Maria, "Life Adjustment Program of a Catholic High School," *Catholic Education Review*, 49 (April, 1951), 253-256; Sister Mary Janet, "The Catholic Schools and Life Adjustment Education," *National Catholic Educational Association Proceedings*, 1952, 343-344.

[65] Msgr. Edmund Goebel, "The Christian Philosophy of the Life Adjustment Program," *National Catholic Educational Association Proceedings*, 1952, 349.

[66] Sister Mary Janet, "Life Adjustment Opens New Doors to Youth," *Educational Leadership*, 12 (Dec., 1954), 141.

The Twilight of Public Alternative Education: Professional Malignancy, An Historical Perspective

James T. Sears
Trinity University
San Antonio

and

John D. Marshall
University of Texas
at Austin

If men could learn from history, what lessons it might teach us! But passion and party blind our eyes, and the light which experience gives is a lantern on the stern, which shines on the waves behind us!

Samuel Taylor Coleridge

Remembering the struggles of women and men to reform their society, its institutions, or themselves is a valuable function of history. While each human being is unique and each epoch distinctive, the wisdom generated from failures and successes at social reform is part of our collective heritage. It is a heritage that social visionaries, institutional reformers, and spiritual guides may draw upon for illumination and action.

In *Schooling in Capitalist America*, Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis (1976) discuss three major periods of liberal educational reform: the common school movement, progressive education, and the "free school" or alternative school movement. Two of these reform periods have occurred during the past three generations. Each had its leaders — women and men who achieved prominence as a result of their involvement in and with formal organizations which "embodied" the reform movement. Through journals, memoranda, reports, letters, and interviews, these leaders and their organizations, which came to represent each movement in the public's eye, have much to tell us.

Using personal histories and archival materials in this paper, we seek to (a) assess the impact of the International Consortium of Options in Public Education (ICOPE) on the alternative schools movement from the perspective of those most intimately involved, and (b) compare and contrast certain aspects of the growth and decline of the Progressive Education Association (PEA) and the progressive movement with that of ICOPE and the alternative school movement.

A variety of important parallels can be drawn between progressive education and the PEA, and public alternative education and ICOPE. This paper will look primarily at one important parallel: the consequences of the "professionalization" of each organization *vis a vis* the larger reform movement it claimed to represent.

We can imagine what it must have been like to attend the PEA's Twelfth Annual Conference in Baltimore at the Emerson Hotel in 1932. Sheltered from the chill of winter and the pangs of the depression, Association members, on the whole, would have had little foreshadow-

ing of what was to come. It was a rather large gathering of fairly well to do people. Frederick Redefer, former executive secretary of the PEA and someone who has recalled those days often, remembers the Association's conferences as collections of educators with "an amazing display of altruism and commitment." (1975:28-9)

Being the second after-dinner speaker that evening, most members would have been listening, politely if not intently, to Dr. Counts' impassioned recitation, "*Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?*". His words rekindled the sort of social reform conscience that had been modeled by such people as Jane Addams and Jacob Riis prior to World War I. The PEA, however, had been founded and nurtured by persons who shared a 'different vision' with regard to the purpose of schooling. Surely, Counts' dare must have stunned and excited many.

> The challenge of Dr. Counts was easily the high point of the program. Following the dinner meeting . . . small groups gathered . . . to discuss, until far into the night, the issues raised . . . These discussions were marked by a general willingness to accept the viewpoint of Dr. Counts. . . . There was, however, a considerable difference of opinion as to how this was to be accomplished.[1]

This challenge evolved into a "taking of sides": while progressive education was practiced by a wide variety of believers, the PEA, as an organization, had provided a very narrow center of attention. (Graham, 1967:56) What Counts offered in his dare was an alternative to the child-centered focus of the Association. Eventually, "the growing differences between those interested in the growth of the individual and those interested in the needs of a society made for a major division in the cohesiveness of the PEA," (Winick, 1978:vi)

This division produced factions, each laboring to solve the problems of education in the manner it deemed best. A similar "shotgun" approach to educational problem solving was to typify the alternate school reform movement of two generations later. As Vernon Smith[2] lamented:

> There's no agreement in this country on what the problems in education are; and when you don't agree on the problems, it's unlikely that you're going to agree on the solution.

Forty years passed. Another conference was held, this one at the Leamington Hotel in Minneapolis during the early days of October, 1973. More than a thousand people — students, teachers, administrators, planners, evaluators, researchers, school board members, parents, community members, and university professors — gathered to engage in "an energetic pursuit of more humane methods of facilitating public education in a pluralistic society."[3]

As JamesMacdonald (1972:11) writes:

> The sixties saw an increasing ferment for change in education, and the sign

> of the movement toward a "new" progressivism became clear toward the end of the decade. What apparently began as a response of the critics to the "results" of the previous progressive era upon schooling became a new progressive impulse . . .

These "new" progressives or, as they came to be called, "alternative schoolers," represented a broad span of beliefs; their unifying truth was simple: conventional public schools were not serving all students equally well. They had come to Minneapolis to share and learn. The National Consortium of Options in Public Education (NCOPE), a group promoting options *within* public education, had sponsored this assemblage. Unwisely, perhaps, NCOPE (which soon afterwards acquired an international breadth, thus NCOPE became ICOPE) had invited a number of people who were spending their efforts working for change *outside of* the public school system. Many of these people had quite different notions of the actual definition and purpose of schooling. At the risk of oversimplifying the many complicated perspectives represented by this latter faction, and in the interest of brevity, we will call them the "free schoolers."

But the distinction made between public and non-public supporters is certainly not a simple one. Scattered throughout each of these factions were attendees who had differing arguments for what they believed. For example, some fled the public school arena because they thought that alternative public schools would only help to legitimate an educational system they found fundamentally flawed. Others were operating outside the system because of their feeling that public schools destroyed the freedom and holistic potential development of young people. Some people who supported alternatives within public schools embraced the general values which public schooling represented. Other reformers believed that work must be conducted within a system to bring about its change.

Adding further complication and interest to this convention crowd was the diversity of socio-political viewpoints. In general, the public alternative school people sought to reform (or create) individual schools or pockets of schools with a distant eye toward ultimately effecting public education as a whole. The first issue of ICOPE's newsletter, *Changing Schools* (issue #1, p. 2), states:

> The monolithic structure that has characterized American education for so long is finally beginning to break. We are moving to a diverse structure of "public schools of choice," in which parents, students, teachers, and administrators participate in a democratic environment of educational options and individual decision-making.

In contrast, the non-public school supporters hoped, among other things, that in by-passing the "monolithic structure," their efforts would have a more direct impact on the quality of society. Frank Lindenfeld, writing in the non-public school oriented *New Schools Exchange Newsletter*, (1974:15) exemplifies this perspective:

> Free schools can also be seen as an expression of the New Left philosophy of establishing counter-institutions within the existing society. The theory is that social change can be brought about not only through political change, or violent revolution, but also through reconstruction of the society from below and within. Because the existing society is corrupt, the alternatives will be more attractive than the official institutions, and will begin to attract clientele away from them. The public schools and other establishment organizations will wither away, as more and more persons refuse to do any business with them. A parallel society will be built up within the interstices of the old, and will replace the older society as people shift their allegiances from less attractive establishment institutions to more attractive alternatives, in what amounts to a non-violent revolution.

Given this dissimilar collection of invitees it is not surprising that this potpourri of alternative school supporters was never unified. On the contrary, despite the efforts and intentions of most, the ideological poles, like those of a magnet, were set in a sort of permanent repulsion. An example of this inability to come together was the fray regarding participants' lodging. The organizers received free or greatly reduced fees for the use of the hotel's conference facilities in exchange for some "guarantee" of room rentals. Nevertheless, when participants began arriving (some greeted by a kazoo band!), one of the organizers themselves (perhaps at the request of some of the student participants) set up a table to coordinate free housing for conferees *in front of the hotel's main desk!*

By the end of the conference (described by one participant as a zoo), "many weary Convention participants were beginning to wonder what it all meant. They had heard so many diverse opinions that hardly anything seemed clear."[4] One thing became clear, however: there were at least two distinct camps of people committed to change through education. These groups would not soon unite.

The parallels seem clear. The leadership and most members of the PEA, up to the time of their 1932 conference, were comfortably unquestioning of their Association and its principal direction: a concern for the child and a respect for the new science of child study. That is, until George Counts addressed the convention. From that evening forward, believing in progressive education would become more philosophically and politically difficult than most members cared to tolerate. ICOPE, likewise, had molded an organization all but devoid of anyone who felt a need to know more precisely what *was* and *was not* going on in the alternative schools movement. The big mistake with this conference, according to Vernon Smith, was "trying to please too wide an audience . . . We did involve some non-public school people in the planning of that conference. We intentionally counted that broad definition of alternatives there that more of us believed in. We thought it might help to make a better conference." Whether it was better is debatable, but dull it was not! As an organized reform movement, alternative schooling, like progressive education, began to bare its extremes to participants and observers alike.

The disagreements within the alternative movement are very similar to a lot of the disagreements that existed in the early Progressive Education Association. . . . There were the child centered people . . . There were also people . . . who really [did] believe that there is a social vision that is necessary . . . You also had the academics . . . (Herb Kohl)

Just three years before the Minneapolis conference, at Indiana University, Dan Burke, a young and ambitious assistant professor, initiated a series of discussions with Vernon Smith. Concerned about the inability of public schools to prepare some youth for productive roles in society, and noted for his organizational wizardry, Burke proposed the establishment of an Institution for Change in Education (ICE). Smith, Burke's colleague and a former Colorado secondary teacher turned professor, was leary of grand visions but provided a critical ear.

After several sessions, a third junior faculty member was invited to collaborate. Robert Barr had seen much during his year as a Ford Fellow. Working at the U.S. Office of Education, Barr had enjoyed the regular company of prominent educational and political figures while visiting a variety of "new" schools nationwide. "Within a few months [of my arrival at Indiana] I was *gagging*!" Barr reminisced. "I said I just can't spend the rest of my life, or even a big chunk of it in teacher education. . . ." In Barr's joining Smith and Burke the die was cast. Taking their ICE proposal to the Dean would surely offer at least the possibility of an interesting near-future.

Alternative education, however, was not their immediate concern. According to Barr, their pitch to the Dean went something like this: "'There's got to be some really exciting schools out there, and we'd like to try to find them.' We weren't looking at alternative schools — we just wanted to find effective schools."

Between February and April, 1971, their Dean provided travel monies. During this time, Smith, Burke, and Barr met with Robert Binswanger and Dave Budding of the U.S. Office of Education, Gerald Randall and Quintin Lawson from the Drop-Out Prevention Program, Mary Miller of General Learning Corporation, and others. As it became apparent that support for ICE was unlikely, the direction of the project began to shift. The Dean, seeking proposals for a multi-million dollar federal grant for innovations in teacher education at Indiana, encouraged the trio to gather extensive data on non-public educational alternatives and to submit an abstract for an alternative school teacher training program.

Soon the project's focus had shifted dramatically. A study group was organized to develop the training proposal, position papers were drafted, alternative schools across the country were visited, a funding proposal was submitted to the U.S. Office of Education's Experimental Schools Division, and trips to the East and West coasts were made in order to meet with "new schoolers" such as Arthur Pearl, Mario Fantini, and Herb Kohl.

Non-public educational alternatives, the trio from I.U. concluded, had a dim future as a means toward educational reform. The focus again was adjusted, coming to rest this time on *public* alternative programs. Subsequently, a two day conference was hosted for superintendents of ten public school districts and initial contacts were made with at least six foundations. Barr remembers that:

> We got really excited about it. . . . We kept getting larger and larger groups together; we were going to do a newsletter . . . have a national organization; we were going to do regional conferences and national conferences and . . . we were going to have a training program. Of all the things that we were going to do, the one thing that wasn't very "sexy" was the training program . . . The others sounded like they meant travel and publications and visibility and contacts and wheeling and dealing: those were the fun and exciting things![4]

University obligations of research and teaching coupled with the energy that this flurry of activities demanded "required us," Barr noted in a memo to his chairperson,[5] "to schedule a continuing series of luncheons, weekend, and evening meetings." Although Indiana had provided seed money and faculty release time, it was clear that over the long haul, the vision of alternative public education as "the only clue to educational reform and renewal in this century"[6] would have to be reconciled with the demands of the University. As Barr's immediate superior underscored in a memo:[7]

> [W]hile a university can be a place for action, it must be a place for scholarship. Members of the social studies education faculty should be distinguished scholars who regularly publish high quality research related to their interests . . . Therefore, whatever your interests are, it is important for your future at Indiana University that you attend to the research implications of your work.

Failure to meet those demands would mean that the hope of "more fulfillment and hopefully mak[ing] us more effective in our impact upon our profession" would never materialize.[8] Because of these conditions, the teacher training program became critical. "The teacher education program was simply a necessity" according to Vernon Smith "because that's what schools of education do. If we wanted to spend time in [other] efforts, we had to link it to a teacher education program."

Operating as the International Consortium of Options in Public Education, Burke's "leg-work," Smith's thoughtful writing and solid demeanor, and Barr's salesmanship soon transformed their dream into reality. They held numerous conferences, arranged for special sessions at ASCD, AACTE, NAASP, and ASAS, and secured publications in journals such as *Phi Delta Kappan* and *Nation's Schools*. These activities allowed them to bring together large numbers of people interested in change through education. More than any other organization, NCOPE/ICOPE, through the work of this Indiana triumverate, was succeeding in organizing and legitimizing an "international public alternative school

movement." One manifestation of this, to be sure, was their plan for a UNESCO-supported International Conference to be held in Minneapolis in the fall of 1973. After nearly three years of work which can be described as anything but uninteresting, this was to be a grand occasion — and virtually everybody was invited. Roy Weaver, current editor of *Changing Schools*, commented on one important outcome:

> Whatever bitterness was created [at the Minneapolis conference] is still inside a lot of people.

The major differences which crystalized at the Baltimore and Minneapolis conferences were essentially ideological. The basic question was: What is the purpose of our action? For the child-centered progressives as well as the ICOPE supporters, "education must be adjusted to the needs of the many different kinds of children who were clients of public education." (Ravitch, 1974:167-8) The social reconstructionists and the majority of the non-public free schoolers a generation later saw themselves as "part of a widespread effort to liberate individuals and institutions from bondage to repressive modes of life."[9] Efforts at finding compromise or common ground were unfortunately absent.

Following the 1973 alternative schools conference, the bitterness between the "Indiana University Gang" and those who philosophically allied themselves with men and women such as Miriam Wasserman, Len Solo, Jonathan Kozol, Linda Hutchenson, and Herb Kohl deepened. On the surface, the disagreement rested over the decision of the Indiana people to, in Barr's words, "work with any type of option [alternative school] rather than exclusively working with options that had more philosophical hook-ups with what would be described as progressive education ideas." Underlying this schism was the viewpoint, articulated by Kohl, that the Indiana group was "trying to make it [alternative education] into a business; trying to make it into a formula, [feeling] that there could be a *science* of progressive education."

The Indiana group, naturally, saw little validity in their critics' slurs. Describing themselves as "anti-academic" and "generally left-of-center in terms of our ideology," the leaders of this thrust to create "options in public education" defended their actions strongly. Tom Gregory, co-director of the program in its later years, thought that these critics were taking words such as alternative and choice and "chang[ing] the meanings of them." He wonders even today why these people "should condemn a movement that is based *for*, if nothing else, the sake of variety."

Another response to their having been "fussed at in the early days by the free schoolers" was to proclaim their critics' ignorance. The disapproving voices, according to Vernon Smith, belonged to "people who didn't understand public education." Some of the more persistent dissenters, he decided, "were totally out of it!"

The alternative schools in or out of the system that worked always had

A fundamental characteristic of the political manifestation of Progressivism was its reliance on a knowledgeable elite. This cadre of experts replaced an earlier generation of "ordinary" people, rendering public policy on the basis of professional judgement — not on political issues and their implications. The PEA, a child of this era, soon became dominated by this professional ethos. (Graham, 1967:154-58) Educational change — whether resulting in a better child or a better society — was thought to best be brought about through the orchestration of knowledgeable experts. In time, it was believed, the number of progressive teachers and administrators would grow, and entire schools and school systems would reflect progressive beliefs. Whether the results were to lead directly to a new social order or to masses of well-balanced problem-solvers who would eventually become an enlightened body politic, a "better" society was everyone's wish. One fundamental miscalculation in both of these grand schemes, as Cremin (1961:185) reminds us, was that "professionalism ultimately divorced [progressive education] from the lay power necessary to sustain it in the schools." Years later, leaders of both factions of the alternative schools movement, pursuing a quixotic search for educational reform would suffer from what Len Solo described as "a period of forgetting" their progressive education roots. As organizers, some, too, would forget those who they represented and to whom the movement owed its conception.

An early issue of *Changing Schools* (issue #3, p. 13) announced the initiation of a new experimental program "to prepare teachers for new roles now emerging in alternative public schools." Characterized by extensive field experience, this training program was designed

> to help participants develop a theoretical and conceptual background in alternative schools, survey a wide variety of different learning styles and learning environments, and attempt to prepare themselves for a particular role in alternative public schools."[10]

The philosophy of change reflected in this training program had its roots in Progressivism. With the hope of expanding public schools of choice, a professional coterie of specialists, provided with an esoteric body of knowledge and armed with an impressive set of credentials, were trained. Professionalization, then, addressed the concerns posed by public school people and articulated by one administrator in an article penned by Barr and Burke: (1973:64)

> In our entire school district, we found no one who had ever worked in an open school, much less a free school or a school without walls. Oh, we had a few teachers who had read John Holt and maybe Herb Kohl, but nobody had the intellectual toughness and the down-to-earth know-how to get the thing going.

Not surprisingly, some of the Indiana training program graduates as well as some free school activisits succumbed to the siren's lure of profes-

sionalization, returning to the schools, in Kohl's phrase, as "cognitive freaks instead of decent human beings."

The professionalization of alternative education, too, was evidenced by the growing number of "experts" lecturing across the country, authoring books and articles, and serving as consultants. These were the "circuit riders" as Herb Kohl explained: "people who were talking to lots and lots of people, who were being listened to, and whose books were being read." "There were a lot of charismatic people around" Barr recalled, too, "and they were an unusual collection . . ."

But to whom were their appeals directed? Who was their audience? What were the purposes of their efforts? To what degree were these leaders' energies directed toward an appeal to the university crowd, public school personnel, and "educated" young adults? How much of this leadership was directed toward alleviating the oppressive conditions of public schooling they so deplored?

Answers to these questions are as varied as the factions which comprised the alternative education movement; they reflect personal interest and ideological bias. Most, though, would agree that the professionalization of alternative education is a useful lense with which to examine such questions.

For some, the professionalization of alternative education was at the root of its demise. Solo explains:

> It became accepted by colleges and universities. People went on lecture tours. It became *professionalized*. It wasn't the kind of raw novices . . . no grass roots level kind of thing popping up here and there. There was a fatal flaw in a kind of hubris sense that happened, a kind of pride in thinking that one had to go beyond what he or she was doing in the one spot to make it good; leaving that to do something grander and larger.

In an effort to expand the movement (acknowledged by those former leaders today as naive), alternative education was institutionalized and its grass roots activities — along with their leaders — professionalized. In Orwellian fashion, success bred failure: the results were bitter recriminations and the failure of the "movement" to extend beyond islands of decency in a sea of educational entropy.

"Nobody was speaking of alternative schools within the system," Kozol explained, "until people who were genuinely oppressed had first stuck out their necks and given their blood to start alternatives outside the system." He continued:

> Bob Barr's relationship to the alternative schools movement is very much like Lyndon Johnson's relationship to the civil rights movement. After five years of *agonizing* grass roots labor — [during] which we seldom got more than four hours sleep a night, year after year, living on shoestrings, working for salaries like two thousand dollars a year — it became essential for some

part of the educational establishment to ratify, adopt, and incorporate what we had done.

As more people scrambled to get on board, the human qualities constituting the life-blood of alternative education were trampled underfoot. The reduction of alternative education to what Herb Kohl referred to as a set of "six unambiguous rules" was, for many, a frightening sign. (Of course, Kohl himself, author of such books as *The Open Classroom and Reading, How To*, was no less guilty.) If success could be predefined and the opportunity for failure minimized, then alternative education was lost. According to Kohl, "The mistakes you make are the very process of education that you have to go through as you are trying to create new forms." It was this *spirit* of alternative schooling which Kozol, Solo, and others felt the "Indiana Gang" had exorcised.

Those who worked out of Indiana would have a problem accepting such an interpretation. Tom Gregory, for example, believes that alternative education would have failed had it not been professionalized. What saved it, he feels, was its institutionalization which provided opportunities for networking, conferences, and professional training.

[This movement] is part of one's personal history and attitudes and values, more than it is an intellectual commitment. To me, it's almost like every generation creates its own history almost in a vacuum. Roy Weaver

The vision of educational reform, the spirit of innovation, optimism, and comradery, and the profound sense of mission which distinguished leaders in alternative education during the early seventies have, in the eighties, given way to more complex assessments and humble dreams, more carefully prepared schemes, less reliance on commitment of others, and a cautionary preliminary investigation of personal consequences. Robert Barr, abandoning his vision of profound change in public education, speaks today of "islands of reform." Herb Kohl, who sees himself as one of the dozen or two dozen people during the height of the alternative schools movement "who were being listened to," sighs existentially, today, remarking "one does what one has to do." Len Solo, once a zealous activist for social and educational change and an alternative schools teacher-trainer in Massachusetts, quotes William James on the need to work at the "molecular kind of moral level from individual to individual." Grand visions, like good wines, mellow with age; the missionary fervor and faith in unlimited possibilities they spawned provide surviving activists with fond memories as well as expanded and wizened perspectives. "It's very important not to be overcome by the immensity of things," Jonathan Kozol says musingly. "Fight battles big enough to matter but small enough to win!"

Is this, indeed, the twilight of alternative education? During the heat of debate at the Constitutional Congress, when even the most enthusiastic delegate harbored grave reservations as to whether a consensus could be reached, Benjamin Franklin grappled with similar questions. Robert W. Clark, (1983:411) in *Benjamin Franklin: A Biography*, describes one

such situation:

> As the document was being signed, Franklin looked up at a chair on which Washington was sitting and behind which a sun was painted. Artists, he remarked, often had difficulty in differentiating between a rising and a setting sun. "But now at length," he said to those near him, "I have happiness to know that it is a rising and not a setting Sun."

We, like Franklin, prefer to view alternative education not in its twilight but at its dawn. But, as Jerry Smith, former co-director of the Indiana program underscored, this requires a profound sense of history.

> Society, as a whole, is still moving, though not as rapidly, toward a more progressive outlook: more tolerant of lifestyles, views, and educational programs . . . Who knows how many hundreds of years it will take to evolve to the point where people can actually say that this is a distinctively different era?

Commenting on both the "new" progressive educators of the 70s and the "old" progressives of the 1930s and 40s, Macdonald rightly observed: "There is no progressive education. There are only attempts to progress in education." To dedicate oneself to any *movement*, then, may not be the greatest focus after all, for in so doing one may easily lose the importance of the individual, personal efforts toward change. It is only when the movement is personalized and internalized that we can feel certain that there will always be a dawning.

Notes

[1] "NOTES ON THE CONVENTION" in *Progressive Education* 9 (April): 288.

[2] Quotations and references appearing without standard citations are taken from personal, taped, telephone interviews.

[3] ICOPE Convention Reporter, (undated): 1.

[4] ibid., p. 16.

[5] Memo to Robert Barr dated 18 May, 1971.

[6] Mimeographed document distributed to prospective graduate students, which described the Educational Alternatives Project (circa 1973).

[7] Memo to Robert Barr dated 16 November, 1971.

[8] Transcripts from jurisprudential evaluation of Indiana's teacher training programs, 1977, p. 17.

[9] These words, written by John Dewey shortly before he died, were read by Charlotte B. Winsor (1976:138), a former student.

[10] Mimeographed document, distributed to prospective graduate students, which describes the Educational Alternatives Project (circa 1973).

Resources

Barr, Robert
1983 Taped telephone interview with James T. Sears, 5 October.

Barr, R. and D.J. Burke
1973 "New Teachers for New Schools," *Viewpoints* 49 (July): 63-75.

Bowles, S. and H. Gintis
1976 *Schooling in Capatilist America*. NY: Basic Books.

Cremin, L.A.
1961 *The Transformation of the School*. NY: Vintage Books.

Graham, P.A.
1967 *Progressive Education: From Arcady to Academe*. NY: Teachers College Press.

Gregory, Tom
1983 Taped telephone interview with James T. Sears, 6 October.

Holt, John
1983 Taped telephone interview with James T. Sears, 10 October.

Kohl, Herb
1983 Taped telephone interview with James T. Sears, 3 October.

Lindenfeld, F.
1974 "Notes on the Origins of the Free School Movement" *The New Schools Exchange Newsletter* 118 (September): 14-17.

Macdonald, J.
1972 "Introduction," in J.R. Squire (ed.), *A New Look at Progressive Education*. Washington, DC: ASCD.

Ravitch, D.
1974 *The Great School Wars*. NY: Basic Books.

Redefer, F.L.
1975 "The Progressive Education Association," *Childhood Education* 52 (October): 25-30.

Smith, Jerry
1983 Taped telephone interview with James T. Sears, 29 September.

Smith, Vernon
1983 Taped telephone interview with James T. Sears, 29 September.

Solo, Len
1983 Taped telephone interview with James T. Sears, 6 October.

Winick, M.P.
1978 *The Progressive Education Movement: An Annotated Bibliography*. NY: Garland.

Winsor, C.B.
1976 "Early Progressive Schools II," in R. Dropkin and A. Tobier, *Roots of Open Education in America*. NY: Workshop Center for Open Education.

Weaver, Roy
1983 Taped telephone interview with James T. Sears, 29 September.

PART III
A Past Perspective on Childhood Theory and Practice

Ontario's Kindergarten-Primary Movement: Utilitarianism Subverts Idealism

B. Anne Wood
Dalhousie University

At the turn of the century a dynamic inspector of the Toronto public schools, James L. Hughes, culminated a quarter-century of kindergarten campaigning by writing his celebrated *Froebel's Educational Laws for all Teachers*.[1] He depicted the kindergarten movement as heralding a new philosophy of education. It offered an optimistic, child-centered methodology which stressed learning through self-activity and the correlation of subject matter with the child's widening experience. Nature study, classrooms filled with concrete materials and a new form of classroom discipline based on love and the child's interest were characteristic of this new education movement.

Twenty-five years earlier Hughes had spent an "epoch-making" morning visiting a Boston kindergarten. It transformed his view of the education process and gave him a focus for his introduction of the new education movement into Ontario. Hughes asked Madame Kraus-Boelte, a founder of Boston's Froebelian kindergarten, to recommend a teacher who could introduce it to his city. One of Kraus-Boelte's star students, Miss Ada Marean, the future Mrs. Hughes, subsequently moved to Toronto and set up her Froebelian private kindergarten here in 1878. Five years later Hughes opened the first publicly-supported kindergarten at Louisa School with Marean as its Supervisor. By the end of the 1880's kindergarten classes had opened in London, Hamilton and Ottawa. Provincial grants helped maintain them and teacher-training classes had been established in the Normal Schools by the Department of Education. A Toronto commercial firm even specialized in the sale of kindergarten materials. In 1902 there were 120 kindergartens operating in the province, 247 trained teachers and over 11,000 five-year-olds attending the classes, all in urban centres. Hughes predicted that the kindergarten would become a "universal ideal," broad enough to make it the true basis of growth towards higher stages of consciousness and deep enough to guide mankind towards a higher level of civilization.

But ten years later Ada Baker, President of the Kindergarten Department of the Ontario Educational Association, had dropped these idealistic aims and cited the pragmatic social gains of the kindergarten movement:

> Among these results we see many movements which are now the concern of every progressive community. We see the relation of Kindergarten principles to the playground movement, to school gardening, to reforms in nature study, to manual training, to domestic science and even to the present enthusiasm for technical education. Through its earnest child study the Kindergarten has helped much towards improved educational methods generally by protesting against the former formal processes of

> school life. It has led to the idea of a social education, one of its strongest points, and in the matter of improving children's literature, and art has done much, and will do still more. It has brought the home and school much closer together, and related the school to the great outside world.[2]

Its idealism had been useful, she allowed, in showing how to make ideals practical to young girls in the kindergarten training school. Quoting Miss Susan Blow, she stated that it would make them aware of their own deep impulses. " 'It will then be impossible for a woman to be anything but some form of nurturer.' "[3]

There were problems, however, with the kindergartens in practice. Both Baker and the Ontario Department of Education were concerned about the rapid decline in the number of kindergarten teachers-in-training, the cost of the classes, their isolation from the mainstream of the public school and the under-utilization of kindergarten teachers' services (they worked for only one-half day). A feeling prevailed in the public that the kindergarten was "a species of luxury." Since over half of the province's population in 1911 lived in the country, most children were educated in one-room rural schools. Kindergartens were economically possible only in large urban centres. But the Department considered the primary causes of the kindergartens' demise to be their "intensely Froebelian" theoretical principles, which created a gulf between the kindergartners and the public school teachers. The academic ineptitude of the youthful kindergarten teachers was also cited; this prevented them from putting the Froebelian philosophy correctly into practice.[4]

As far as other teachers were concerned, it was whispered "in Ottawa and Toronto that Kindergarten teachers because of short hours, freedom from school duties to attend afternoon teas and special opportunities such as 'closings' to receive public notice were coming to consider themselves somewhat superior to the rank and file of ordinary teachers who must toil from 9 A.M. until 4 P.M. with large classes, in rooms with bare walls and few facilities for any activities except the traditional three r's,"[5] according to Dr. J.H. Putman, Inspector of the Ottawa public schools.

Dr. H.T.J. Coleman, Associate Professor of Education at the University of Toronto, provided more scholarly insight in an article on "Froebel and Modern Theories of Play," written for *The School* in 1912.[6] Defending Froebel's notion that play is a basic, creative activity of all mankind, he cited the biological and behavioural findings of G. Stanley Hall and Edward Thorndike to the effect that play should be inculcated more directly: "Children brought up in isolation or in slums of great cities have to be *taught* to play. . . . It has much to do, . . . with the training for participation in civilized life."[7]

As Putman wrote, the kindergarten had changed in many ways from its German rural roots; the industrial environment demanded updated roles such as the fireman or the postman instead of the charcoal burner. Froebel's "fanciful ideas about crystallization and about mathematical forms and his attempts to teach abstract mathematical ideas to very young

children through the use of 'gifts,' " claimed Putman, "shows that he knew very little about the mathematical power of an average five-year-old child."[8] He was also critical of American commercial interests, which "adroitly fostered" expensive Froebelian materials and techniques, such as mat-weaving (designed to teach mathematical symmetry and an appreciation of colour), on gullible kindergartners.

For pedagogical and professional reasons, then, the Minister of Education announced in 1912 that a special committee would be set up to study the kindergarten regulations and courses of study.[9] Its Chairman was Dr. Coleman and the five other members included Putman, two kindergarten directresses, a principal of a Normal School, as well as a Toronto public school kindergarten supervisor. The committee's training bias was reflected in its primary recommendation that a kindergarten-primary training course be established to bring about a closer liaison between the kindergarten and the primary grades. It was predicted that this would attract a greater number of applicants who would become qualified to teach at either level. Its urban social preoccupation with the industrial slum child was reflected in its recommendation that in areas where four-year-olds needed all-day care, special day kindergarten classes should be set up which would provide the children with lunch. Current American concerns over laggards and retardation were reflected in the committee's major recommendation that a kindergarten-primary class should be created for precocious children. The programme of this class would concentrate on handwork but would also undertake reading readiness and number work and correlate these skills with oral language. This last recommendation was to be strongly fought by the Froebelian kindergartners.

As well as these changes the committee recommended a number of other functional refinements. The recommendations included a range of specialized tasks to keep the kindergarten teachers employed for a full day and allow them to achieve equality of status and pay with their grade school colleagues. Following the recommendations of O.E.A.'s Kindergarten section, the committee urged that a special departmental inspector be appointed who would encourage local authorities to organize new kindergartens. The Department was also advised to promote this important phase of schooling through bulletins, conferences and examination questions so that Froebelian principles could be applied throughout the school system. The Montessori system, which the committee studied,[10] was rejected for Canadian kindergarten children because of its excessive concentration on individualism, although Normal students were encouraged to study its theory and practice.

Canadian educational administrators were attempting to heal by means of these institutional recommendations the disquieting splits which had occurred within the kindergarten movement in North America. The child study advocates, for instance, criticized the small equipment and fine Froebelian handwork required of young children. They recommended that a freer type of art work and large muscle activities replace Froebelian

play, that jungle gyms, ladders and slides supplant circle games and songs. A serious schism developed within the American kindergarten movement between the Reconstructionists, led by Miss Patty Smith Hill, and the Froebelians, led by Miss Susan Blow and Mrs. Ada Hughes. The Reconstructionists urged that the findings of functional and behaviouristic psychology as well as the social goals of instrumentalist philosophy be incorporated into the kindergarten in the form of projects, a socialized curriculum and educational activities more finely tuned to the child's physical and intellectual stage of development.[11] Miss Blow warned that this narrow utilitarianism would obscure the connection between the child and God. Free play would destroy self-control and discipline.[12]

A special committee appointed by the International Kindergarten Union presented the three opposing opinions, which included a moderate camp led by Miss Elizabeth Harrison. Its 1913 report, claims Barbara E. Corbett,[13] resulted in the eventual loosening of the Froebelian formality and structure. Larger objects and materials, which were used in very different ways, replaced the Froebelian gifts and occupations and the Froebelian programme was largely discarded. But the report recommended the retention of self-activity as a basic tenet of childhood education. In time free play began to replace the Froebelian guided play. "The ideal kindergarten became a miniature society where each activity served a useful purpose, and where each child learned self-control through social co-operation,"[14] concludes Corbett.

This institutional healing of the philosophical breach "worked a subtle but nonetheless radical transformation in the philosophy of the kindergarten,"[15] suggests Marvin Lazerson. Instead of reverencing the child in its individuality, the reconstituted kindergarten only attempted to socialize him for subsequent schooling. Rather than imbuing her with self-confidence and allowing "freedom and opportunity for creative activity,"[16] she was to be conditioned into correct habits of behaviour. As Dominick Cavallo asserts, "the environmentalism of progressives had little if anything in common with the philosophical idealism of orthodox Froebelians: their respective conceptions of the child's 'nature' were radically antithetical. And, as Evelyn Ross has demonstrated, by 1920 progressives had control over curriculum formation and had all but eliminated the influence of orthodox Froebelians."[17] Citing both external and internal causal factors — rising costs, growing professionalism, the scientific efficiency campaign and the influences of child study and stimulus-response psychologists — Lazerson and Cavallo account for this shift from a revisionist perspective. But was the transformation of the kindergarten so radical?

Recent Canadian studies[18] suggest that utilitarianism was implicit in neo-Hegelian thought. A close examination of Hughes' interpretation of Froebel bears this out. Kindergarten rhetoric and practice proclaiming

this Creed of Practical Idealism, as Terry Cook calls it,[19] was shot through with utilitarian assumptions which strongly forecast its subsequent subversion.

Ostensibly, according to Hughes Friedrich Froebel's philosophy was spiritual. Influenced by German idealistic philosophers,[20] he believed that all objects contained a kernel of spiritual meaning — God's will unfolding in the universe. Because of this all things in the universe were united and the aim of education was "to make that unity perfect, so that humanity may become conscious of the unity, and that its consciousness of unity with God may lead it to reverent and co-operative activity with him."[21]

At four years old the kindergarten child was particularly sensitive to this unity in the universe. Froebel characterized its stage of mind as "symbolic." It delighted in seeing analogies and resemblances between the inanimate objects of nature and personality. Instead of merely describing this symbolism (in Piagetian terms, the animism of the egocentric stage of development), Froebel interpreted it as seeing "spiritual associations," hidden relationships between man and nature or God. His lifelong task became the development of a system of education to explicitly cultivate these meaningful relationships. But it was to be done in a naturalistic manner.

Because the child found his identity and gradually realized his powers through self-activity, Froebel stated that he learned most effectively in a child-centered environment, either a playroom or outdoors in nature. Given opportunities for freedom and creative self-activity, he claimed, the child's will and interest were developed through her decision-making. She then became happy and productive. Play had a powerful moral effect on the child; it created self-faith, which in turn led to the development of a strong character. Froebel designed a number of material objects by which the mother or teacher could surreptitiously channel the child's playful self-activity towards a unifying, evolutionary view of the world. They were also designed to curb the child's will so that he would acquire "respect for human law and reverence for Divine law. The perfect work of Christianity," wrote Hughes, "will be accomplished when all mankind is consciously, reverently, responsively, co-operatively submissive to the Divine will."[22]

Froebel's gifts, occupations, games and stories were permeated with his developmental, rational perspective of reality. The sequence of forms depicted in the gifts, for instance, which proceeded from simple to complex, was designed to foreshadow in the child's mind the continuity between the stages of life of man as well as the creative possibilities of evolutionary rather than revolutionary types of development. The child was prevented from destroying one form in order to create another. More blatant indoctrination of co-operative social forms of behaviour was

depicted in the plays and games. They were designed to exemplify the unifying relations between home, society, nature and God. Occupations and some games prepared children for later comprehension of the interdependence of all grades of society with the ultimate intent of acquiring a reverence for the working class. In fact, all of Froebel's material objects were designed to cultivate a passionate desire to modify the condition of things and to cultivate an aggressive attitude, so necessary, wrote Hughes, for human progress.[23] Play with material objects also made the child constructive and self-reliant, important attributes of original and intelligent workers. Outdoor games, in turn, cultivated courage, emphasized the importance of social relationships and awakened a sympathetic interest in the world of work experienced by labourers in the industrial world.[24] There was a utilitarian social intent, then, in all of Froebel's pedagogical devices.

Although Froebel's law of unity was not to be explicitly spelled out to the kindergarten child, as in the manner of Victorian moralists, it permeated the rhetoric used by kindergarten teachers and provided justification for their new classroom practices. Beginning with the activity of his senses, claimed Mrs. Ada Hughes in an address to the National Education Association in 1891,[25] the kindergarten child began his intellectual journey by defining and separating the essence of the material objects he handled. She called this first stage receptivity. It led ineluctably to the second stage, reflection. Here the isolated facts were connected and relationships discovered between objects. The aim of the kindergarten method, then, was "not activity of the senses alone (that would develop only selfishness)," commented Mrs. Hughes, "but to help the child to organize his sense activity into intellectual forms — to help him make the transition from material holding to intellectual." Just as the senses define, then, "the thought reunites into an organic unity."[26]

It was this process of creating relationships that the Froebelians considered the most important aspect of their new teaching method. Because the child derived great pleasure from the process, which was linked carefully to his everyday experiences and surroundings, he gained a sense of "executive power." He associated knowing with doing and delighted in what the Froebelians called the law of organization; "The kindergarten helps the child to organize his feeling . . . and secures the climax of execution by guiding always to a definite result, which at once becomes a reality by connecting it with his experience in play."[27]

By depicting intellectual development as an individual psychological process with organic unity but with no outside reference point, the Froebelians were led away from their original spiritual goal and towards a restricting social imprisonment of the child. He first became trapped within his own feelings and sense of his own power. As Ada Hughes explained, "The starting-point, the process, and the result are seen as a related whole, and the child has the thrill of a creator's delight as the finished work lies before him. He has a conscious sense of individual power through knowing how the work was accomplished."[28] Lulled by

his sense of executive accomplishment and programmed into further self-activity towards finding rational relationships and expressing them, he is "led . . . to associate result with process, and as the process has revealed the result, so a result is seen as a fact or truth or condition [which] at once implies a past process of creation, a present relationship, and an ever-growing influence. Facts," Hughes continued, "are no longer dead, but living realities, and thus in the school of things he is made ready for the school of facts."[29]

And the "school of facts" that she and her fellow Froebelians had in mind was primarily a more subtle and lasting form of moral indoctrination. This was betrayed by their rhetoric justifying increased sense training in classroom practice. "In games and song," wrote Hughes, "the sense of [aesthetic] taste is made to contribute to his intellectual growth by becoming the discriminating power in determining through the qualities the nature of material things, instead of being solely a means of pleasure through the gratification of appetite."[30] Thirty-two years later, its spiritual aura discarded, this same aesthetic gospel became explicitly utilitarian. In arguing the advantages of clay modelling, a kindergarten occupation, in the regular grades, Ottawa's Dr. Putman commented, ". . . we are so wholly dependent upon foreign countries for ideals and creations of things beautiful that it might be thought our people would welcome with open arms every attempt made in our schools to cultivate the taste of the young." And he asked, "Shall we never develop anything distinctively Canadian except snow shoes, shingles, newsprint and agricultural implements?"[31]

By this time the Froebelian emphasis on social conformity and practical forms of intellectual activity permeated the more progressive elementary school systems. As Putman paraphrased John Dewey in 1915, "The thing that counts most is the expression of self in some action that has social meaning and therefore moral value."[32] Ironically, then, the utilitarianism of the Creed of Practical Idealism had by this time subverted its Christian spiritualism. Froebel's child-centred education, by concentrating on the child's naturalistic processes had displaced his concepts of immanence and rational cognitive development. His disciples became fixated in the evolution of *their* consciousness on the materialistic and social plane of reality, leading them to search for more overt forms of social control and behavioural modification. Ontario's kindergarten-primary movement illustrated this utilitarian subversion.

The year 1915 marked the enforcement of the new kindergarten-primary regulations. Henceforth only legally qualified kindergarten-primary certificate holders were allowed to teach these classes. Two reasons were cited by Ontario's highly centralized Department of Education for these new regulations. The old argument about lack of correlation with the course work of Form One was trotted out. But now a new, probably more realistic one, was introduced. Reflecting the norms of scientific efficiency, Dr. John Seath, Superintendent of Education, in a memo to Premier William Hearst wrote, "Experience having shown that

the education of the maturer pupils has been retarded by attendance at the Kindergartens, a new class of school, the Kindergarten-Primary, was authorized . . . for providing a course the content of which is the more advanced work of the Kindergarten and the junior work of Form I."[33]

Miss Lillian Harding, in charge of Toronto's Withrow Avenue Kindergarten-Primary class, elaborated on what was really at stake. Apparently the kindergartners adamantly refused to let their pupils do any reading or writing, thus delaying their passage through the grade school by a full year. In her opinion, kindergartens should have the same aim for education as all other grades, namely "to give each individual ability and power in the social life, and to prepare him to live well in the kindergarten and in the life to follow. The first mission of the kindergarten is to the school, the second to the home. . . ."[34] In the name of the kindergarten's basic principle, self-activity, the child should be saved from "arrested development (modernly called retardation)"[35] and the "formalism" of kindergarten practices by being allowed to read books, particularly if he was ready and eager to do so. She outlined a grouping plan whereby all children would begin in the kindergarten environment utilizing the major components of the programme, but adding reading, oral language and drawing. In February she formed a new junior class of those she considered were too mature (the majority of the class) for kindergarten work. They began the initial work of Form One. She found that the increased interest and joy of the children in this new phase of schooling made her duties very worthwhile.

A different opinion of the kindergarten-primary movement was held by Superintendent Seath and by an experienced Ottawa teacher. Seath, in his memo to the Premier, believed that by 1918 the kindergarten teachers were mounting a steady opposition to the new classes, even though a number of them had obtained kindergarten-primary certificates either through summer school courses in Toronto or Ottawa or through the new Normal courses. He also cited the "defective" qualifications of the public school inspectors, who, like the public in general, remained largely ignorant of the need to introduce this new level of schooling. Seath deplored the year's retardation of pupils which resulted from this lack of progressive adjustment. Miss Margie Rattray, who taught for many years in Ottawa's kindergarten-primary summer school, considered that Putman's efforts to establish a new kindergarten-primary class in Cambridge Street School under the supervision of Miss Dobbie in 1915 was largely a failure. Even though she was assigned three assistants, she was unable to handle the discipline and gave up after one year.[36]

But Putman persisted and badgered the Department to set up a kindergarten-primary teacher-training summer course in eastern Ontario, arguing that he could not get enough qualified teachers for his kindergarten programme. In 1918 his wish was granted with the Department putting him in charge of two other teachers. His progressive pragmatic approach to the training programme, however, was revealed in a series of letters

exchanged with the Department. He galvanized the fifteen teachers and his two assistants to support his recommendation that the second summer session be dropped and that proof of two years' successful experience be sufficient to gain their kindergarten director's certificate. Seath duly circulated Putman's recommendation to key kindergarten people in the province and got back a split vote. Five supported Putman, on condition that the teachers were properly supervised. Five strongly Froebelian kindergartners adamantly opposed him. Miss Mary E. Macintyre, Kindergarten Directress at Toronto Normal and Model Schools, wrote, "I consider that Dr. Putman's idea, if carried out, would mean the death of Kindergarten in Ontario in a very short time."[37] She and others declared that students could not thoroughly understand the Froebelian principles or the proper use of the materials in only five weeks. Putman's suggestion would lead to the depletion of the kindergarten in a short time.

The kindergarten section of O.E.A. mounted its attack on this watered-down version of the kindergarten. Resolutions were submitted to the Minister of Education every year beginning in 1920, complaining about the reduction in 1915 of the kindergarten training course at the Normal Schools from two to one year. The kindergartners claimed standards declined when the kindergartens were merged with the new kindergarten-primary classes and they petitioned for a reinstatement of the two-year course, as prevailed in the United States and England.[38]

Whether the kindergarten-primary movement was responsible for this so-called decline in standards or whether their own utilitarianism had now subverted Froebel's original spiritual thrust, the result was a deadly formalism which descended on kindergarten practice. In a paper on "Clay Modelling For the Kindergarten," delivered to the Ontario Educational Association in 1920,[39] Miss Mabel Cunningham described her use of the Froebelian gifts. Instead of developing apperceptive centres of feeling by means of the child's experimentation with each gift, Cunningham outlined a formal skill-training exercise. The teacher first demonstrated to the children how to make a ball, and while they practised this skill she didactically spelled out its functional manifestations in the material world from the creation of day and night to its use as ball bearings in all fine machinery, thus converting a Froebelian self-activity into an Herbartian object lesson. Rather than let the children discover how the ball could be transformed into different everyday objects, the teacher explicitly demonstrated how to make a cup, dwelling on the "how-to" of the operation. By the time she had advanced formally through the cylinder, cube and square prism to the fifth gift, the community model, the children must have lost any vestiges of creative self-activity they might once have possessed.

Miss Cunningham, however, was so blinded by her own idealistic theory that she believed that she was indeed appealing to their symbolic stage and she claimed that

> All the things I have mentioned, from the ball to the city architecture, are things which will enter largely into the life of every child in your class,

enter as real things, and also as symbols. The children are vitally interested in such things as: Crescents, crosses, circles, suns and stars. They love stories about such things as the swastica, the fleur-de-lis, the lion and the unicorn, and heraldry in any shape or form.

The wise use of these things will result in their imbibing the highest ideals for their own lives and for their country. I would fire their imagination with all the glory of these old symbols, always for newer and better means of interpreting them, and would tell of the good and true men and women who have used them down the ages, to the honor and glory of the human race.[40]

The rhetoric tended to conceal her utilitarian aim, which was to indoctrinate the children with respect for "the classicial forms, . . . the history and present use of symbols, and [with] a grounding in good, honest work, which will stand the children in good stead all through life, and longer if necessary."[41] Froebelian practices and symbolism were now to be made explicitly utilitarian: they were designed to produce moral, acquiescent citizens.

In actual practice it would seem that they had a rather severe effect on the sensitive kindergarten child. The late Irene Putman, Dr. Putman's daughter, recalled her own embarrassed squeaks and subsequent accident on her first day in the Ottawa Normal kindergarten in charge of the formidable Froebelian, Miss Elizabeth Bolton.[42] Both Miss Rattray and the late Nan Slinn, another retired Ottawa public school kindergarten teacher, recalled the large kindergarten classes they taught in which there were on the average forty to fifty children.[43] Froebelian materials, such as clay, blocks, sticks, coloured paper and cutting scissors continued to be used in formal, didactic fashion well into the 1930's in Ottawa, despite Putman's progressive grade-school reforms. (An individual exercise booklet illustrated weaving, sewing on dotted lines, paper folding and cutting with little or no opportunity for experimentation or self-expression). Clay modelling dealt with seasonal objects, such as Easter chickens, or forms connected with a story. Ottawa kindergarten teachers were given summer school training at Columbia University or at the Mechanics Institute in Syracuse, but this was for their specialized half-day work teaching handwork, folk dancing or singing games to the other grade classes when the kindergartens weren't in session. Miss Rattray reported that kindergarten teachers remained largely within their own in-service group and had only a limited influence on the other primary grade teachers.

Between 1913, the peak year, and 1925 the number of students enrolled in the kindergarten classes in Ontario declined substantially (see Table 1):

TABLE I

ONTARIO KINDERGARTEN & K-P CLASSES AND TEACHERS

	No. of Children Attending Kindergarten	No. of Children Attending K-P Classes	No. of Kindergarten Certificates	No. Holding K-P Certificates
1913[a]	23,289	nil	386	N/A
1916[b]	17,450	N/A	371	69
1919[c]	16,386	7,560 (s.s. 1,758)	283	118
1922[d]	13,233	12,057 (rural 2,511)	258	213
1925[e]	14,251	12,839 (rural 3,164)	136	354

[a] Ontario. *ARME 1914*, Table 0, p. 121.
[b] Ontario. *ARME 1917*, Table 0, pp. 245, 298 and 299.
[c] Ontario. *ARME 1920*, Table 2, pp. 134, 138 and 146.
[d] Ontario. *ARME 1925*, Tables 2 & 3, pp. 62 and 63.
[e] Ontario. *ARME 1927*, Tables 2 & 3, pp. 98 and 99.

The kindergarten-primary classes in the province, on the other hand, although suffering from slow growth in their initial years (1917 — 2,793 pupils),[44] continued to attract an increasing number of children, particularly in rural regions and in the separate schools, areas which previously had not had any kindergartens.

It would seem, then, that the initial efforts of key reformers, such as James and Ada Hughes and John Harold Putman, to imbue the entire elementary school system with the kindergarten philosophy had limited effect on the school system. Neil Sutherland claims that Froebel's ideas of child-development, a child-centred environment and the importance of self-activity had become part of Anglo-Canadian pedagogical thinking by the end of World War One.[45] But in a keynote speech in Toronto in 1982 he wondered why the new education movement in Canadian schools had retreated into formalism by the 1920's.[46] Was this a retreat or a continuation of the thrust of neo-Hegelian or Froebelian socialization? Thirty years after Hughes' message had been delivered its idealistic rhetorical mask had been dropped and its real utilitarianism laid bare.

Notes

[1] James L. Hughes, *Froebel's Educational Laws for all Teachers* (New York and London: Appleton, 1897), xiii-296 pp.

[2] Ada H. Baker, "President's Address, Kindergarten Department," Ontario Educational Association [henceforth, O.E.A.], *Proceedings 1910*, p. 230.

[3] Ibid.

[4] "The Kindergarten," *The School*, 3(2), October 1914, pp. 76-79.

[5] J.H. Putman, *Fifty Years at School, An educationist Looks at Life* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin, 1938), p. 63.

111

[6] H.T.J. Coleman, "Froebel and Modern Theories of Play," *The School*, 1(2), October 1912, pp. 86-95.

[7] Ibid., p. 92.

[8] Putman, *Fifty Years at School*, p. 65.

[9] "Report of a Special Committee on the Kindergarten Regulations and Courses of Study," Ontario. *Annual Report of the Minister of Education* 1913 [henceforth, Ontario. *ARME*], pp. 328-340.

[10] S.A. Morgan, *The Montessori Method* (Ontario. Department of Education, 1913), 72 pp. and H.T.J. Coleman, "The Children's House," *The School*, 1(7), March 1913, pp. 456-461; Ibid., 1(8), April 1913, pp. 519-523; Ibid., 1(9), May 1913, pp. 582-586.

[11] Dom Cavallo, "From Perfection to Habit: Moral Training in the American Kindergarten, 1860-1920," *History of Education Quarterly*, 16(2), Summer 1976, pp. 147-161.

[12] Susan E. Blow, "Kindergarten Chats," in William H. Goetzmann, ed., *The American Hegelians, An Intellectual Episode in the History of Western America* (New York: Knopf, 1973), p. 292: "In its jubilant sense of conformity with nature, and in its swift surrender to fatal impulse, the free-play kindergarten repeats in its tiny circle the self-destructive sweep of naturalism. In its tendency to conceive the child as shaped and fashioned by the historic process; in its reaction from intellectualism to an exaggerated voluntarism, and in its practical emphasis upon functional values, the industrial kindergarten betrays the influence of pragmatism."

[13] Barbara E. Corbett, "The Public School Kindergarten in Ontario, 1883 to 1967, A Study of the Froebelian Origins, History and Educational Practice of the Kindergarten in Ontario," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Toronto, 1968, p. 25.

[14] Ibid., p. 26.

[15] Marvin Lazerson, "Urban Reform and the Schools: Kindergartens in Massachusetts, 1870-1915," *HEQ*, 11(2), Summer 1971, p. 127.

[16] Hughes, *Froebel's Educational Laws*, p. 45.

[17] Dominick Cavallo, "Kindergarten Pedagogy: A Review Essay," *HEQ*, 18(3), Fall 1978, p. 368.

[18] Leslie Armour and Elizabeth Trott, *The Faces of Reason, An Essay on Philosophy and Culture in English Canada, 1850-1950* (Waterloo: Wilfrid Laurier University Press, 1981), xxvi-548 pp.; A.B. McKillop, *A Disciplined Intelligence: Critical Inquiry and Canadian Thought in the Victorian Era* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1979), xii-287 pp.

[19] Terry Cook, "George R. Parkin and the Concept of Britannic Idealism," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 10(3), August 1975, pp. 15-31.

[20] Hughes, *Froebel's Educational Laws*, p. vi: "Froebel . . . had become fasci-

nated with Schelling's first system, and he, too, like Hegel, adhered to the doctrine that the Absolute is Mind."

[21] Ibid., p. 3; compare Blow, "Kindergarten Chats," in Goetzmann, p. 296: ". . . the citadel of Froebel's thought. The goal of education is a true world-view and a conforming life."

[22] Hughes, *Froebel's Educational Laws*, p. 161; compare Blow, "Kindergarten Chats," in Goetzmann, p. 294: "Since children spend their lives in a waking dream, education must so influence them that their dreams shall be prophecies of truth. Since their waking dream is an active drama, the form through which prevenient imagination must seize upon truth is the typical deed. What a child does he tends to behold. What he plays he is, he tends to become. Through creating in play an ideal world he will be prepared for an ideal interpretation of the actual world. Representing in play an ideal self, he will be incited to that self-surrender and self-conquest whose goal is self-fulfillment." and p. 295: "In short, will not wisely directed play with archetypal forms gently lead little neophytes of thought out of the realm of nature's effects into the realm of her causative processes?"

[23] Hughes, *Froebel's Educational Laws*, p. 145.

[24] Ibid., p. 151; compare Blow, "Kindergarten Chats," in Goetzmann, p. 297: "The duties of life arise out of its relationships, and the doing of duty creates ideal types of character. The good man is an affectionate son, a kind brother, a faithful husband, a protecting and tender father, a staunch friend, and a genial comrade. He is also an industrious member of the economic organization and a grateful recipient of its lavish bounty. He is a patriot ready to respond to the call of his country. He feels that appeal of a common humanity and is prompt to help the needy and succor the weak. He lives in sympathetic touch with the invisible source of life, and through the two great acts of religion, worship and sacrifice, perpetually renews the tie which binds him to the heavenly powers.

In view of this close connection between relationships, duties, and character, it is evident that if we desire to reveal the ideal to children, or better, if we wish to help them discover it for themselves, we should incite them to play that they are kind fathers, tender mothers, obedient sons and daughters, affectionate brothers and sisters, busy members of the working world, soldiers marching in defense of flag and fatherland, and worshipers old and young answering the call of the solemn bell and wending their way to the mysterious building whose spire . . . points to the sky."

[25] Mrs. J.L. Hughes, "Kindergarten Methods in Intellectual Training," National Education Association, *Proceedings 1891*, pp. 533-538.

[26] Ibid., p. 535.

[27] Ibid., pp. 536-537.

[28] Ibid., p. 537.

[29] Ibid., pp. 537-538.

[30] Ibid., p. 535.

[31] Ottawa Public School Board, J.H. Putman, *Senior Inspector's Annual Report 1923*, pp. 19-20.

[32] Ibid., *Inspector's Report 1915*, p. 18.

[33] Archives of Ontario, Cody Papers, MSS, V, Papers relating to Education, Box 61, Correspondence as Minister of Education, Envelope 1, 3 August 1918-13 June 1918, Item 6, unsigned copy of Memo for the Premier of Ontario, "Necessary Reforms arranged in the order of their urgency and feasibility," p. 5, #14, 'A Reorganization of the Provincial system of the Kindergartens and Kindergarten-Primaries.'

[34] Lillian B. Harding, "The Kindergarten-Primary," *The School*, 5 (1), September 1916, p. 23.

[35] Ibid., p. 24.

[36] Interview with the author, Ottawa, June 1975.

[37] Archives of Ontario, R.G.2, P-3, 1918, Box 51, 8-37, Item 1: Mary E. Macintyre to Dr. Seath, Toronto, Aug. 10, 1918.

[38] Ibid., R.G.3, Ferguson Papers, General Correspondence, 1926, Box 83, Education, copy of O.E.A. resolutions from kindergarten section.

[39] Miss Mabel Cunningham, "Clay Modelling For The Kindergarten," O.E.A., *Proceedings 1920*, pp. 284-289.

[40] Ibid., p. 288.

[41] Ibid., p. 289.

[42] Irene Putman, unpublished MSS, Ottawa, 1976.

[43] Interview with the author, Ottawa, 1974.

[44] Ontario, *ARME 1925*, Table 2, p. 62.

[45] Neil Sutherland, *Children in English-Canadian Society, Framing the Twentieth Century Consensus* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1976), pp. 17-18.

[46] Ibid., "The Triumph of Formalism, New Education in the 1920's and 1930's," unpublished keynote address, Canadian History of Education Association Conference, Toronto, February 12-14, 1982.

The Farm-School System of 19th Century Europe and Its Legacy*

Trevor J. Phillips
Bowling Green State University

This paper represents one aspect of a larger study, child emigration, that the author has been pursuing for several years. Some form of transportation or sending-out of unaccompanied juveniles from England has been occurring on a very modest scale since the early seventeenth century, but the number of children between the ages of six and eighteen who became a part of emigration schemes placing them in various countries of the Empire, was much in excess of 100,000 by World War II.[1]

Most if not all of these youngsters could be included within one of three general categories: those who were *dependent*, lacking any real support by virtue of the poverty, illness, criminality or death of their parents: workhouses provided for such children; those who were *neglected*, chiefly by parents who could, but did not, provide adequately for them, and, in any event, whose own lives and circumstances militated against their exercising even minimally their parental duties; and those who were, in legal terms, delinquent. All these children, with or without a background of crime, were in one way or another taken from or induced to leave their home or street existence and submit to 'depauperization,' which included being cleansed and fed, given some rudimentary education, both religious and secular, together with industrial training, all designed to prepare the prospective emigrant for his or her life as a laborer in Greater Britain. Almost always a part of this basic training was farm work, held by many to be a necessay prerequisite for colonial life, farmers constituting the largest bloc of child employers. But this emphasis on farm work and rural living was due not entirely to New World demands for child labor. Rather it was one consequence of an idea, begun in Europe in the 1820s, which was to affect the thinking and practice of reformers in both Britain and the United States. Child emigrators Dr. T.J. Barnardo, Annie Macpherson, and Maria Rye, educators of delinquent and pauper children Sydney Turner and Edward Brenton, all in England, Charles Loring Brace of the Children's Aid Society in New York City, the Illinois School of Agriculture and Manual Training for Boys and the Burnham Industrial Farm School, in the States, all testify to the irrepressibility of the philosophy which, as will be shown, helped influence in some fascinating ways the work of these child savers on both sides of the Atlantic, and, in the process redefined the education of destitute and delinquent children.

*The author wishes to express his indebtedness to the following for providing funds that made this paper possible: The Faculty Research Committee, the College of Education Research Committee, and the Department of Educational Foundations & Inquiry, all of Bowling Green State University.

Charles Fourier (1772-1837), utopian socialist and soul brother of Welshman Robert Owen (1771-1858) provides an extreme but historically interesting preface. His flights of fancy included the conviction that, with the advent of Utopia, the sea would be desalinated and assume the flavor of lemonade, and "the world would blossom with thirty-seven million playwrights, each one as good as Molière."[2] More realistically, he posited an ideal community, the *phalanstere*. A contraction of 'phalanx' and 'monastery,' the phalanstery was a profit-sharing commune comprising about one hundred families.[3] It is as a reflection or distant echo of this ideal that some have seen the continental farm school system.[4] Although such schools and/or agricultural colonies were established in most of the countries or states of northern Europe, it is to two in particular — in France and Germany — that attention will be drawn, for it is these which became the models for most other similar institutions on the continent, and the inspiration for foreign imitators.

The farm-schools owe their origin to the efforts made "to relieve misery, resist the progress of pauperism, and give a moral training to the very poor."[5] In addition,

> They tend to relieve the towns of their superabundant population, and stop the influx from the country; they give new life to industry by diminishing on the one hand competition for employment, and, on the other, augmenting the produce of food; and finally, they open a way to the reclamation of wastelands at home and the colonization of unoccupied wilds in foreign countries.[6]

One class of farm-school was established for adults, apparently with little success; another, designed for children, was of two types: one, for "the maintenance and training of the destitute to habits of industry,"[7] the other comprising reformatories for those actually convicted of a crime. Joseph Fletcher, the chief inspector of schools in England, whose short book on the continental farm school system published in 1852 provides much valuable information, left no doubt whatever as to his perception of the status quo within which humane work was to be undertaken and reform effected, leaving the overall structure and the class boundaries safely intact:

> The aim of education in reformatory schools is to correct vicious habits and to form honest men, good christians, and useful members of society. Its essential purpose is to maintain the children in the humble sphere in which they were born, to point out to them the necessity of imbibing a taste for industry, and to prepare them for the performance of the humble duties, and for employment in the subordinate occupations, which their birth and social position impose upon them. Its foundation, too, must be laid in religion, without which there is no real education.[8]

The spirit of Rousseau was, by the first decades of the nineteenth century, still hale and hearty, and those who had come under the influence of his writings on childhood development were faithfully adhering to his admonition to give up the dogmas of the past and substitute the art

of observation if one truly wished to understand the mind of the developing child. Jean Henri Pestalozzi like Rousseau was persuaded that education did not necessarily imply a classical training; the school's main object was not to teach but to develop, to capitalize on the goodness of human nature. Working with extremely poor peasants around Zurich, Pestalozzi attempted to formulate a curriculum that would be appropriate for them. He was dubious about the value of knowledge *per se*. "The thing was not that they should know what they did not know, but that they should behave as they did not behave."[9] Insisting that right action could be achieved only through right feeling, Pestalozzi brought a measure of love and caring into the lives of his pupils, as well as self-reliance through instruction in spinning and general work, the proceeds from the sale of which helped support the enterprise.[10] It was this combination of agriculture and manual training, together with the realization that both the how and the what of teaching are equally important, which was, as a philosophical concept, to spread rapidly throughout western Europe. A colleague of Pestalozzi, Emmanuel Fellenberg, directed an agricultural colony at Hofwyl, near Bern, run on principles similar to Pestalozzi's. Wehrli, his assistant, eventually left Hofwyl to open a normal school for the training of prospective teachers in the Pestalozzian tradition,[11] and it was his work as much as his predecessors' that caught fire in adjacent countries.

The two farm-schools, inheritors of this tradition, to be considered in some detail, the Rauhe-Haus, a reformatory school, at Horn, near Hamburg, Germany, and the colony of Mettray, near Tours, France, have provided the stimulation and impetus for similar projects in the United States and England. The Rauhe-Haus was one of the many manifestations of a prevailing movement in Germany, begun to counter the influence of Rationalism and the religious condition it allegedly bred in that country, and to "call back the people from the abstract, mystical, skeptical tendencies which have distinguished them so long, and bring them back to the practical good works of religion."[12] Faithful followers of the movement, 'Friends of the Inner Mission,' devoted their energies to rectifying what for them was nothing short of shameful: the neglect by the people of works of charity. Perceiving that "spirituality has little connection with education,"[13] they proceeded to establish institutions to assist the poor and indigent. The leader of the movement and founder of the school, a man who "in another age, and in other circumstances, would have been the *Loyola* of a religious society,"[14] was Johann-Heinrich Wichern, whose object for the Rauhe-Haus was to seek out persons and families in distress and afford them relief.[15] Very soon, however, the greater need for a reformatory school for juvenile offenders made itself felt, "with the view of assembling and correcting the vicious and morally-endangered children of the city."[16] In 1833, Wichern, together with his first three boys, occupied a donated house situated on an acre of land.[17] By the end of the year the number of boys had grown to twelve. The basic idea was to put no perceptible restraints on the inmates; no locks or keys were permitted. As successive groups of twelve children were formed, they were constituted a 'family,'[18] at the head of which was

a superintendent, assuming the role of father-figure, but known as 'brother,' and it was this 'institute of brothers' that, as will be shown, formed the basis and became the hallmark of the whole organization of the Rauhe-Haus and its many farm-school imitators.[19] By 1850 there were about one hundred children, a third of whom were girls, living in twenty houses, many constructed by the inmates, situated on forty-one acres of land. The children were taught a trade, how to build furniture, and to make their own clothing.[20]

What the founders of the more prominent European farm-schools or agricultural colonies had in common was the conviction that in order to be successful with children, that is, to achieve improvement in behavior if not permanent rehabilitation, it was not sufficient to hire as teachers casual employees who perceived their work simply as a job for which they would be duly recompensed. What was actually required was the employment of those with "motives superior to those of merely material existence."[21] Wichern was an early advocate of this view and, by the 1850s, had thirty-four 'brothers' on his staff, who, along with their instructing and custodial duties were themselves students. Candidates were expected to be between twenty and thirty years of age, provide proof of sound character and diligent practice of their religion, to be free of all physical ailments, have a working knowledge of agriculture or, at the very least, be "endowed with the necessary aptitude for acquiring one or other of these professions."[22] Finally, they had to be of sufficient intelligence to absorb whatever instruction was to be made available to them — and it was to be substantial — in order that the quality of work with the children might be enhanced. Topics to be covered included religion, sacred and profane history, the German language, geography, pedagogy, singing, instrumental music, and English.[23] In effect, what was being offered, or, rather, imposed, was a normal school curriculum, a teacher-training syllabus, contained in special courses for twenty hours a week, the completed program extending over four years. The science of teaching had finally been born.

A visitor to the school was Charles Loring Brace, later to become the first secretary of the Children's Aid Society in New York City, and to launch the 'placing-out' system, which, between 1853 and 1890, 'emigrated' over 90,000 urban destitute children to America's rural north-east and mid-west.[24] "Nothing," Brace was to declare in 1881, thirty years after his visit to the Rauhe-Haus, ". . . can be better for the child of poverty than sending him away from the misery and temptations of a large city to a kindly farmer's home,"[25] and "the principle which lies at the basis of all modern prison-reform, and of all improvements in charity [is] the absolute necessity of individual influence on the poor."[26] In other words, asylum-type institutions were for Brace of little value, even harmful, as custodians of poor children who had run afoul of the law. Brace was impressed from the outset by the appearance and feel of the Rauhe-Haus, looking as it did "as little like the usual home for vagrants, as is possible,"[27]

> I saw no squads of boys walking demurely about, but looking as though the very devil was in them, if they could only let it out. There were no heavy-looking overseers, discoursing piously of the number whom Providence had committed to their charge — and thinking of their pockets. And there was not even the invariable home for forsaken children — the huge stone building, with the one bare sunny court-yard. The idea seems to have been here, that to those who have no home of their own, as much as possible should be given of the home which God had prepared for all.[28]

That Brace became enamored of the Rauhe-Haus is self-evident from his writing, but he was a man well-versed and experienced in the problems of vagrancy, pauperism and juvenile crime in his own city of New York, and his observations are also clearly prompted by what he perceived as immense differences between what was happening in Europe and what he felt should be occurring in the United States. His final word on the subject of the Rauhe-Haus contains more than a trace of personal determination to attempt some measure of emulation.

> . . . that [the Rauhe-Haus] should send out not only skilled apprentices, saved from the prisons and alms-houses, but educated young men [the brothers] to teach others, and to spread abroad the self-denying Christian principles of the place — and most of all, that it should have existed seventeen years and by its well-conducted industry, have almost supported itself, may fairly constitute it one of the wonders in benevolent effort.[29]

In 1839, some six years after the Rauhe-Haus was opened, the agricultural colony of Mettray was founded, the first of its kind in France, by de Metz and the Viscomte de Bretigneres de Courteilles. Again, early colonies were of two classes,[30] those intended for the education of pauper, orphan, foundling, or deserted children, and those devoted to the training of juvenile offenders. In 1852 there were forty-one colonies in France and her possession, Algeria, sixteen of which were of the latter category and twenty-five of the former.

Just as the Rauhe-Haus had its Charles Loring Brace to widely disperse details of its objectives and organization, so Mettray had its own proselytes, among whom was the Reverend Sydney Turner, chaplain of the London-based Philanthropic Society's school for the reformation of juvenile offenders, later to become the first inspector of Government Reformatory Schools in England when, in 1854, those establishments were finally sanctioned by law. Turner made a formal inspection of the colony, and presented his findings and recommendations to the governing board of the school.[31] His conclusion opened with a cautionary note: However much one may be impressed with the colony, and hence with farm-schools generally, no attempt should be made to transplant it wholesale to Britain. But, he was quick to add, its general principles do have relevance for the Philanthropic Society's school. Turner identified five of these principles.[32]

1. The employment of qualified teachers;
2. The dividing of the inmates into families, who live together in

small, manageable groups;
3. The use of persuasion rather than force;
4. The giving to the boys such active and outdoor occupation as may help them become thoroughly and healthfully employed;
5. The combining of individual charity and interest on behalf of the director and staff with support and sanction of the Government.

It would appear, then, that Mettray shared much in common with the Rauhe-Haus, and it was just this common element that appealed to British and American reformers much concerned with the deteriorating lives of many thousands of city children. The message they were receiving from mid-century onward from the Continent regarding the salubrious effects of rural existence, fueled their already energized imagination and resulted in their concentrating more acutely on emigration schemes. These would, they believed, satisfy the natural human craving for the bucolic life and provide for the indigent and orphaned child a genuine chance to regain his or her health and self-esteem, and an opportunity to become a productive adult.[33]

Since its inception in 1788, the Philanthropic Society had consistently viewed emigration to the colonies as a solution to the problem of what today would be termed recidivism, the reverting by former inmates to unlawful behavior soon after returning to their previous haunts. The Society's commissioners were so impressed by Turner's report that in 1849 the school was moved from London to Redhill, in rural Surrey, in the hope that "knowledge of agricultural pursuits which [the school] now proposes to communicate [in addition to various trades in which the children were already being instructed], [will be] looked upon as the best and most effectual education which boys destined for Australia, the Cape of Good Hope, or other colonies, can receive."[34] The Redhill School, known since the move as the Philanthropic Society's Farm School, was quickly organized on the house system, the sixty or so boys in each house being taught and supervised by a master and his wife. Farm work was their chief occupation, along with instruction in carpentry, tailoring and other useful trades. As recently as the Second World War boys continued to be encouraged by the school's administration to emigrate rather than face an increasingly bleak economic outlook and the consequent temptation to return to delinquency.

Mary Carpenter (1807-1877), almost single-handedly responsible for the eventual introduction into England of reformatory schools for children and for their support by the State, was a keen observer of the European scene, and was soon persuaded that all reformatory schools should be rural, that the influence of nature on children was certainly not the least valuable element for their assured well-being.[35] Her own modest experimental reformatories — the first, a coeducational school, opened in 1852, the second, to which the girls from the first were transferred, in 1854 — were based on the principles underlying the Rauhe-Haus. Particularly at Red Lodge, the girl's school, she strove "to awaken a feeling of confidence in the girls by showing anxiety for their welfare,"[36] for, as Carpenter herself wrote,[37]

> . . . since the prison system, even as best conducted, is proved ineffectual as a preventive and reformatory measure for children, and such institutions as Mettrai [to the principles of which she was equally devoted] have exceeded all expectations, they should be tried. . . . It is not the spirit of fear, but of power and of love and of a sound mind, which can be powerful enough to subdue their hard hearts; and without touching the inner spirit no external measures will be of much avail.

Emphasizing the difficulty of transplanting the continental system to England's seemingly rigid society and equally unyielding educational structure, Joseph Fletcher is at pains to convince his readers that, nevertheless, there is much that the English may learn from their continental neighbors, whose valuable experience

> consists in its testimony to the vast advantage, both moral and economical, to be derived from employing, in spade-husbandry and household duties, the whole of the youthful population, whether pauper, morally-endangered, or actually delinquent, who are permanently thrown on society for support, in groups, or groups of groups, which may be governed as enlarged families and maintained on this system, of really moral and industrial education, at as small a cost, at most, as that at which we now tutor them in indolence and crime.[38]

Declining to lay any blame for his country's failure to attend to the plight of the pauper child — though if fault must be found, he avers, it lies with the state of opinion currently rife in the country — it was nevertheless his hope that "all parties responsible to society" should "recognize and act upon" the following distillation of his investigation.[39]

1. That the farm-schools of the Continent, applied to education for the prevention of crime, hold a special position precisely analagous to that of [the English] workhouse schools.
2. That for the children in these schools, as in those of the Continent, a training in vigorous rural industry, and close domestic economy, by means of farm-schools, conducted on the principles of a Christian family, will yield the greatest attainable moral vigour, with the least amount of indolence and self-deception.
3. That by far the greater number of the present workhouse schools are now producing converse results . . .
4. That the children at a proper farm-school . . . will not cost the public more than under the present system . . .
5. That to have good *preventive* schools for the training of the pauper children, is the great practical step toward obtaining good *reformatory* schools for the re-training of criminal children, on principles well understood and economically applied.

Some of those who had been affected in a fundamental way by the continental farm-school system were alluded to earlier. Annie Macpherson ("My whole being has been refreshed" [after visiting the Rauhe-Haus]),[40] Mary Carpenter ("[I fear] a multiplication of Parkhursts [overcrowded prisons], instead of Mettrais and Red Hills."),[41] and Charles Loring Brace ("The friend of man, searching anxiously for what man has done for his suffering fellows, may look far in both continents before he

finds an institution [the Rauhe-Haus] so benevolent, *so practical, so truly* Christian . . .")[42] were leaders who, in their respective fields, translated to appropriate action the individual lessons they had learned from Europe. Sir James Kay-Shuttleworth, soon to work so ardently for a state education system in England, had in 1839, visited the Fellenberg school for poor children and met with Wehrli who was continuing his master's work. From Wehrli, Kay-Shuttleworth learned of the special relationship that must be achieved between prospective elementary teachers and their students.[43] In 1839 he was instrumental in opening the Battersea Normal School in London which incorporated into its curriculum much that had impressed him on the Continent, particularly the view that the aim of education was to be the formation of character.

In addition to Charles Loring Brace's Society, at least two American institutions bore the imprint of the farm-school movement. The Illinois School of Agriculture and Manual Training for Boys, founded in 1887, adhered to the fundamental principles of Mettray,[44] and the Burnham Industrial Farm, Canaan, New York, opened in 1890, was modeled after the Rauhe-Haus.[45] Additionally, Cleveland's Bellefaire, a residential treatment center for troubled children, has been referred to as a latter-day successor to the Rauhe-Haus.[46] The Illinois School of Agriculture held that

> the school should be located in a fertile agricultural region; . . . the children should be separated into small groups and brought up as much as possible as a family; . . . great attention should be paid to moral and religious training (while avoiding all sectarianism); . . . instruction in agriculture and manual training should form a special feature; and . . . the interests of the children should be watched over after they have passed into the outer world, and . . . the Home should be always their nursing mother and guardian.[47]

The Burnham Industrial Farm shared with Wichern the conviction that "the strongest walls are no walls and that the greatest force is the spiritual or moral force."[48] Its underlying principle was that

> there is something in every boy, however bad, that answers to firm, kind, just treatment, and something that can be developed into usefulness by a system of industry, training and recreation that occupies the entire time of the boy and keeps his thoughts from the old influences. . . . The methods adopted are these: steady training in some industry by which the boy can earn his living when he goes from the Farm; a fair common-school education; a course in civics, music, and military drill; and the strictest simplicity of life and careful teaching as to the care and development of the body.[49]

A final chapter concludes this account of the influence of one movement on diverse people and institutions. The visit of Charles Brace to Hamburg led, as has been seen, to the inauguration of his placing-out scheme, the 'emigration' of New York City orphans and vagrant children to rural areas. In 1866 Annie Macpherson, a British evangelist, had learned of Brace's scheme during a visit to New York[50] and, three years later, from a representative of the Children's Aid Society who was in London to talk about the Society's activities.[51] So it was that the placing-

out scheme provided the impetus for Macpherson and fellow child-saver Maria Rye, both of whom by 1869 had embarked upon their child emigration work, viewing the colonies, Canada in particular, as the equivalent of America's West. Macpherson's 1872 visit to the Rauhe-Haus was, arguably, a consequence of accounts she had learned of in her own country and, undoubtedly, from Brace himself. It would not be fair nor accurate to claim that the British child emigration movement, always an integral part of those educational institutions that embraced the farm-school philosophy, owed its very existence to that philosophy, but it certainly derived from it a measure of sustenance and, perhaps, a *raison d'etre*. Child emigration and the 1854 Parliamentary Act legitimizing support for reformatory schools are, on their own, sufficient testimony to an idea whose roots are based in eighteenth century romanticism and idealism, and whose echo continues to reverberate wherever the education of children, both 'lawful' and 'lawless,' is reevaluated. The proper balance between the academic and the practical in contemporary education, the debate between the forces of retribution and reform in the education of the delinquent, have by no means been settled. The farm-schools offer an historical perspective on these on-going controversies, a modern context for issues that have been associated with education since the days of Plato and Aristotle. Their resolution does not appear imminent.

Notes

[1] See "Juvenile Emigration to Canada: A Glimpse at a Subculture's Health," by the present author, forthcoming in *The Journal of Canadian Culture*, Vol. 1, No. 2.

[2] Robert Hughes, *The Shock of the New*. New York. Alfred A. Knopf, 1981, p 190.

[3] *Ibid.*

[4] See, for example, Charles Loring Brace, *Home-Life in Germany*. New York. Charles Scribner, 1853, p 96.

[5] Joseph Fletcher, *The Farm-School System of the Continent and its Applicability to the Preventive and Reformatory Education of Pauper and Criminal Children in England and Wales*. London. James Ridgway, 1852, p 6.

[6] *Ibid.*

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] Fletcher, p. 21.

[9] Robert Herbert Quick, *Essays on Educational Reformers*. New York. D. Appleton and Company, 1912, p 296.

[10] *Ibid*, pp. 296-297.

[11] Fletcher, p. 10.

[12] Brace, p. 29.

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] *Ibid.* p. 31.

[15] Captain Boscawen Ibbotson, "The Educational System in Germany and Its Advantages." Alfred Hill, editor. *Essays Upon Educational Subjects.* London. Longman, Brown, Green, Longmans, and Roberts, 1857, p 122.

[16] Fletcher, p. 25.

[17] Ibbotson, p. 123.

[18] *Ibid.* p. 124.

[19] Fletcher, p. 27.

[20] Ibbotson, p. 123.

[21] Fletcher, p. 26.

[22] *Ibid.*

[23] *Ibid.* p. 27.

[24] Miriam Z. Langsam, *Children West: A History of the Placing-Out System of the New York Children's Aid Society, 1853-1890.* Madison. The State Historical Society of Wisconsin, 1964, p 27.

[25] Charles Loring Brace, *Address to the Theological Students of Harvard University.* May 12, 1881, p 15.

[26] *Ibid.* p. 3.

[27] *Home-Life in Germany*, p. 91.

[28] *Ibid.*

[29] *Ibid.* p. 96.

[30] Fletcher, p. 29.

[31] Sidney Turner, *A Report on a Visit to Mettray, 1846.* Archives of the Royal Philanthropic Society, Surrey Record Office, Kingston-on-Thames. (#2271/40/5).

[32] *Ibid.*

[33] Several authors have described in detail these schemes and what became of the young emigrants. See, for example, Gillian Wagner's *Children of the Empire.* London. Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1982.

[34] *The Times*, May 1, 1849.

[35] J. Estlin Carpenter, *The Life and Work of Mary Carpenter*. 2nd edition. London. Macmillan and Co., 1881, p. 136.

[36] Ruby J. Saywell, *Mary Carpenter of Bristol*. Bristol. University of Bristol, 1964, p. 9.

[37] J. Estlin Carpenter, p. 119.

[38] Included in the *Report of the General Committee of Management of the Children's Friend Society*, Eighth Annual Meeting, May 31, 1838, p. 42.

[39] *Ibid*, p. 46.

[40] *The Christian*, November 7, 1872, p. 9.

[41] J. Estlin Carpenter, p. 128.

[42] *Home-Life in Germany*, p. 96.

[43] H.G. Good, *A History of Western Education*. 2nd edition. New York. The Macmillan Company, 1960, p. 352.

[44] See William Pryor Letchworth, "The History of Child-Saving in the State of New York." *History of Child Saving in the United States*. Montclair, N.J. Patterson Smith, 1971 (original edition, 1893), p. 111.

[45] *Ibid*, pp. 196-7.

[46] Torsten Erikson, *The Reformers: An Historical Survey of Pioneer Experiments in the Treatment of Criminals*. New York. Elsevier, 1976, p. 128.

[47] *Ibid*, p. 196.

[48] *Ibid*.

[49] *Ibid*.

[50] Lilian M. Birt, *The Children's Home Finder: The Story of Annie Macpherson and Louisa Birt*. London. James Nisbet & Co., Limited, 1913, p. 18.

[51] *Public Archives of Canada*: RG 76 51/2209, pt. 1.

PART IV
Issues In Historical Research

Historical Research for Educational Questions

Joan M. Lakebrink
De Paul University

"Having a history, in its most significant sense, means a consciousness of who one is and where one stands in relation to where one has been."[1]

The history of education can guide educators in evaluating classroom practices in the light of previous techniques and concepts which others have found successful or unsatisfactory. Much of what today is regarded as new or innovative in education has long historical records. Individualized instruction, team teaching, open classrooms, schools without walls, alternative systems of education, work-study programs, nongraded schools, competency based programs, experiential learning were all part of the progressive education experience of the 1930's. Modern educators could learn much from the progressive educators in areas of proposed educational changes. Without using such knowledge, educators begin "inventing the wheel" all over again. John Dewey, in *Experience and Education*, explained the relationship of issues of contemporary life and the past:

> . . . the achievements of the past provide the only means at command for understanding the present. Just as the individual has to draw in memory upon his own past to understand the conditions in which he individually finds himself, so the issues and problems of present social life are in such intimate and direct connection with the past that students cannot be prepared to understand wither these problems or the best way of dealing with them without delving into their roots in the past. In other words, the sound principle that the objectives of learning are in the future and its immediate materials are in present experience can be carried into effect only in the degree that present experience is stretched, as it were, backward. It can expand into the future only as it is also enlarged to take in the past.[2]

Historical study could aid in reassessing educational and cultural traditions as guides for making decisions about the future. Those who make educational decisions need to understand and appreciate the culture in which the schools operate. Educators need to know how problems have arisen, what opportunities and pitfalls accompany them, and what can reasonably be predicted as future developments. A system with blinders, with few alternatives, holds a blueprint for disaster. The significant forces that have shaped the American school system need to be comprehended in order to provide the insight for wise decision making today and in the future.

Notable authors have dealt with the history of education in the United

States. Early histories like Richard G. Boone's Education in the United States: Its History From the Earliest Settlements,[3] focused on the government and organization of schools rather than the social milieu of the schools. The classical piece of "stars-and-stripes" educational history is Elwood Cubberley's *Public Education in the United States*.[4] It is against this work that educational historians of the mid-twentieth century measure the contributions of themselves and their colleagues.

Lawrence A. Cremin[5] applauded Cubberley's work, but also declared that all institutions that deal with educating citizens — families, churches, media, schools, and others — need to be considered in educational history. Raymond E. Callahan studied the school as an institution within its particular social context and found indicting evidence about the subtle purposes in school programs. His *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*[6] became one voice in a sea of voices calling for reform. Michael B. Katz, in *Class, Bureaucracy and the Schools*[7] claimed that schools served to perpetuate the existing class structure. These histories turned the focus away from the accomplishments of the organization and administration of the schools to the students and public served by the schools.

This changed focus was possible not only because of the new outlook of historians in the twentieth century but also because of advanced technology. The computer along with statistical analyses made grassroots history within the reach of those who sought to work with the heretofore elusive and unmanageable records. Records of wealth and property, population statistics, diaries, slave journals, newspapers, personal letters and papers had been available to historians in a limited way. Photoreproduction made primary and secondary sources accessible to more people and computers made the analyses of such records a manageable task. An example of a social concern focused history using modern technology is Edward Stevens and Lee Sutlow, "Quantitative Factors in the Acculturation of Immigrant Children in Mid-Nineteenth Century United States."[8]

Not only does technology influence how and what kind of history will be written, but the social sciences working with history bring specific insights to educational questions. Psychologists have used history in analyzing group and individual behaviors in light of psychological theories. R.L. Schnell[9] has dealt with the problems of dealing with childhood and family influences or personality and subsequent consequences for education. Other social sciences analyze the interplay of economic, social, and geographic factors with politics, institutions and ideas, including those of education and schooling. Educational historians may use the apparatuses of other social sciences and social scientists may use the data and insights of educational history. The point becomes that history is worthy of study in and of itself and as clues for practice.

In a sense, every study undertaken in a school of education is historical in character. A review of literature is a historical study of research done in

the past. Many studies go on to pose an hypothesis and propose a design to prove that hypothesis in an experimental, correlational, causal-comparative, or survey study, although a sizable amount of studies use a historical and descriptive approach including the case study and ethnography.

Historical studies need to be scientific just as other fields of study do and historiography can be scientific to the degree to which the scientific method is applied to data and conclusions. Historians must:

1. define the problem, limit the scope of inquiry
2. search for sources and evaluate their authenticity
3. evaluate the relevance, meaning, and dependability of data obtained from sources
4. organize the data so that facts support the relationships and conclusions which are exposed
5. formulate and test the hypotheses resulting in generalizations which are accepted until proven otherwise."[10]

Sources for historical studies are plentiful because of the very nature of the educational establishment. Schools have numerous artifacts — desks, buildings, books, chalkboards, paper, pencils, files, globes — and written records. Primary sources — first hand evidence — is plentiful because of educators' penchant for keeping written records and because of modern media's capability of recording events on tape and soundtrack. Secondary sources — history texts, encyclopedias, textbooks, newspaper and periodical accounts — discuss the past from the viewpoint of persons close to the scene or of critics about the situation in question. Secondary sources can be used to back up data from primary sources or to ask questions about such data.

With the abundance of data today, is a historian's criticism necessary? Obviously. Data need to be validated as genuine and authentic. The historian asks: Who wrote it? When, where, why, and how was it written? Is it an original or revised version? Are there deletions or additions? What are the physical characteristics of the document? Age? Conditions? Type? Is the language pattern of the document characteristic of the author's pattern in other known documents? Questions such as these ascertain the external validity of the document or artifact. Internal criticism ascertains the possibility and probability of the author's witnessing of the event. Could the author have been an eyewitness? Are the meanings to be taken figuratively or literally? Are dates accurate? What is the authorship of the idea?

Generalizations based on hypotheses and general relationships are tenuous, to say the least. Historical research, by its nature, is limited to a specific area of study, type of practice or population. Research may be focused toward an individual, a group, an idea, a move, or an institution. Topics usually are derived from important issues facing education at the time. History will not answer the question of the day, but it will give a

perspective to allow decision makers to evaluate the present and derive direction for the future. Herbert M. Kliebard suggested that the historical way of dealing with the complexities of problems would make educators "cautious about proclaiming new panaceas and making universal claims. This would be a most welcome ballast in a field where there has been the tendency to offer simplistic solutions to the most complex of questions."[11] He further decried the tendency to deal with questions in terms of "how to do it" rather than as issues requiring a variety of intellectual and ideological analyses.

Kliebard studied the various metaphors possible for addressing schools in the beginning of the twentieth century. Romantic ideas of childhood and growth that produced the notion of kindergarten were available to influence educators as were the activity-oriented ideas of John Dewey and others. Even so, the most prevalent metaphor for persons thinking about schooling was that of the marketplace. Scientific management interpolated corporate management techniques for school management. Not only was administration affected but so was the curriculum. The curricular theory emanating from the scientific management model was translated into "educate the individual according to his capabilities." This meant that materials and methods had to be varied and flexible in order to fulfill objectives that were particularized and predictable. "The school child became something to be molded and manipulated on his way to filling his predetermined social role . . . As the raw material was processed through the curriculum on its way to its ultimate state, simple efficiency demanded a differentiated curriculum in order to achieve the diversification of human labor that a modern industrial society demanded."[12] Kliebard further examined current curricular work produced during and after the second industrial or electronic/technological revolution and found that the bureaucratic models prevalent in the early twentieth century became closer to realization in the second half of the century.

Alternative educational systems developed since the 1960's have been influenced by the marketplace but each has its unique history which causes it to have particular attributes. Studying these histories may help educators understand that not one of the available systems was "written in the stars," as Kliebard warned. Individually Prescribed Instruction has a predominate behavioristic, prescriptive approach whereas Individually Guided Education producers endeavored to humanize instruction by having teachers take into account learning style and interest of the students and then selecting activities that varied from student to student and/or from group to group. Both systems were the work of educational psychologists. A third system also developed in the field of psychology which was Individual Education. Individual Education was developed by Adlerian psychologists who were concerned about students in terms of respect and responsibility. The approaches to educational systems vary in emphasis largely because of their historical development. Understanding these developments may help decision makers in choosing an alternative and in implementing that alternative once chosen.

Michael Scriven suggested that the history of education is a gold mine for those seeking to put into practice a system of research, development and dissemination:

> Not because one can find out from it what will happen if we do X, but because one can find out from it what happened when something very like X occurred before, and hence avoid some of the worst "goofs."[13]

Dan Lortie studied the ethos of teaching by means of history, surveys, indepth interviews, and secondary sources. The contribution of history to *The Schoolteacher*[14] is a significant one. The reader begins to realize why teachers approach their work as they do, how they deal with outside forces toward change, and what they value in their day-to-day interaction with students, staff, administrators, and parents. Anyone concerned with working with teachers or influencing them in their work, including adopting educational change, would do well to study Lortie's sociological study before hand.

In order to answer the question of evolution toward success, researchers utilized historical analyses focused on improving schools rather than model schools. Schools were identified in midwestern urban school districts: Indianapolis, Gary, Fort Wayne, Terre Haute, Louisville, Cincinnati, Chicago and Decatur, Illinois. Two additional districts, Saint Louis and Dayton, served as consulting districts. Local personnel and project staff emphasized manipulable elements in the school environment as they documented the changes in student achievement. Efforts were made to describe the events contributing to increased achievement in detail — who participated, who was affected, what triggered the events. The historical case study approach was supplemented by secondary source literature. Aggregates of the research were provided as were further analyses of variables and recommendations for educational decision making.

Historians use the work of social scientists and social scientists can use the work of historians. History "should, can, and does explain past events least inadequately, which is to say that the historian applies a variety of theories and provides explanation."[27] History cannot test hypotheses as statisticians do, but it can examine the milieu in which the hypotheses were formulated. Histories of people, ideas, and concepts can be useful for the improvement of education today. History can enlarge the store of information and insight upon which teachers and administrators can draw. The preparation of adequate written history has been basic to all the social sciences; it is basic to the improvement and understanding of contemporary educational programs and issues. History may lead to solutions to current problems and satisfy contemporary social needs.

History cannot tell the administrator or teacher what to do at a given moment in a given school or classroom, but history can do many things for the improvement of schooling and education. It can, first of all,

131

examine how students have learned and through what institutions they have achieved their learning. Sloan[15] asserted that the history of education should focus more on the student rather than on the formal agencies of education. History could examine the actual results produced by teaching agencies of education and on the experience the learner has made educational. The event which occurs when a person learns something is the "thing" worth studying.[16] Such study could broaden the understanding of the place of education in American society. It could also provide insight into how various ethnic groups have approached learning. Goody[17] suggested that the value systems within the ethnic group and with the school could be at the base of many of the problems in urban schools today. An inevitable conflict arises in the lifestyle and outlook between the literate culture of the school and the oral culture of the street. A history of the perspective oral and literate cultures in modern technological societies may provide needed insight in order to achieve the goals of education for all groups. Frederickson[18] suggested that such basic American attitudes and values on such subjects as race, sex, work, politics, war, and art could profitably be studied from the vantage point of the history of learning. Such studies could show how "race thinking," etc., has been learned and transmitted. Schools' efforts in applying results of social science research in such things as mental testing have already been the object of historical research. Joel Spring[19] argued that mental testing has led to sorting and pigeonholing pupils and defaming American subcultures. While history cannot change the attitudes of people, attention to education's treatment of minority groups, including the long struggle of handicapped children's parents to get education for their children, may help in providing educational opportunities for all children without current misunderstandings.

The improvement of instruction and learning in the country's large urban schools has been the subject of recent historical research. A Phi Delta Kappa publication, *Why Do Some Urban Schools Succeed?*[20] used historical case studies of improving urban schools to determine how the schools overcame many of the negative factors typically impacting on urban schools. The historical method provided a means of describing the human factors that made the schools work. Much information has been available to policy makers in regard to successful schools; for example, Francis Chase[21] identified program leadership, staff and district commitment, and effectiveness of implementation as crucial to program success. Multiple regression techniques to identify variables associated with high levels of student achievement have yielded the following conclusions: high expectations of staff,[22] better teachers in terms of training, pay, and experience,[23] and background factors[24] contribute significantly to student achievement. Other studies have found that basic skill emphasis makes a difference[25] and being in a school with a large proportion of low-achievers has a negative effect on learning for all students.[26] It is one thing to know that such variables are important to success; it is quite another to implement changes in a school to take into account such variables. How can a school develop into a successful one?

In order to answer the question of evolution toward success, researchers utilized historical analyses focused on improving schools rather than model schools. Schools were identified in midwestern urban school districts: Indianapolis, Gary, Fort Wayne, Terre Haute, Louisville, Cincinnati, Chicago and Decatur, Illinois. Two additional districts, Saint Louis and Dayton, served as consulting districts. Local personnel and project staff emphasized manipulable elements in the school environment as they documented the changes in student achievement. Efforts were made to describe the events contributing to increased achievement in detail — who participated, who was affected, what triggered the events. The historical case study approach was supplemented by secondary source literature. Aggregates of the research were provided as were further analyses of variables and recommendations for educational decision making.

Historians use the work of social scientists and social scientists can use the work of historians. History "should, can, and does explain past events least inadequately, which is to say that the historian applies a variety of theories and provides explanation."[27] History cannot test hypotheses as statisticians do, but it can examine the milieu in which the hypotheses were formulated. Histories of people, ideas, and concepts can be useful for the improvement of education today. History can enlarge the store of information and insight upon which teachers and administrators can draw. The preparation of adequate written history has been basic to all the social sciences; it is basic to the improvement and understanding of contemporary educational programs and issues. History may lead to solutions to current problems and satisfy contemporary social needs.

Notes

[1] Herbert M. Kliebard, "Curriculum Past and Curriculum Present," *Educational Leadership*, January 1976, p. 245.

[2] John Dewey, Experience and Education, 1938.

[3] Richard G. Boone, *Education in the United States: Its History From the Earliest Settlements*, 1889.

[4] Elwood P. Cubberley, *Public Education in the United States*, 1919.

[5] Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley*, New York: Teachers College, 1965.

[6] Raymond E. Callahan, *Education and the Cult of Efficiency*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

[7] Michael B. Katz, *Class Bureaucracy and the Schools*, New York: Praeger, 1975.

[8] Edward Stevens and Lee Sutlow, "Quantitative Factors in the Acculturation of Immigrant Children in Mid-Nineteenth Century United States," AERA Paper, 1978.

[9] R.L. Schnell, "History of Childhood as History of Education: A Review of Approaches and Sources," *Alberta Journal of Educational Research*, September, 1979, 192-203.

[10] Ralph H. Jones, *Methods and Techniques of Educational Research*, Danville, IL: The Interstate Printers, 1973.

[11] Idem, *Educational Leadership* (January, 1976), p. 247.

[12] Herbert M. Kliebard, "Bureaucratic Components of Modern Curriculum Theory," *Freedom, Bureaucracy and Schooling*, 1971 Yearbook of the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

[13] Michael Scriven, "Objectivity and Subjectivity in Educational Research," *Philosophical Redirection of Educational Research* edited by Lawrence G. Thomas, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1971.

[14] Dan Lortie, *The Schoolteacher*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

[15] Douglas Sloan, "Historiography and History of Education," Fred N. Kerlinger, editor, *Review of Research in Education*, Volume I, Itasca: Peacock, 1973, pp. 237-269.

[16] Richard J. Storr, "The Role of Education in American History," *Harvard Educational Review*, August 1976, pp. 331-354.

[17] J. Goody, editor, *Literary in Traditional Societies*, Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press, 1968.

[18] C.M. Frederickson, *The Black Image in the White Mind: The Debate on Afro-American Character and Destiny*, 1817-1914, New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

[19] Joel H. Spring, *Education and the Rise of the Corporate State*, Boston: Beacon, 1972.

[20] Phi Delta Kappa Study of Exceptional Urban Elementary Schools, "Why Do Some Urban Schools Succeed?" Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa, 1980.

[21] Francis S. Chase, Urban Education Studies: 1977-78 Report, Unpublished manuscript, 1977.

[22] Wilbur Brookover and Lawrence Lezotte, *Changes in School Characteristics Coincident with Changes in Student Achievement: Executive Summary*, East Lansing: College of Urban Development, Michigan State University, 1977.

[23] Bureau of School Programs Evaluation *Three Strategies for Studying the Effects of School Processes*, Albany: State Education Department, 1976.

[24] Anthony Pascal, et al., *Analysis of the School Preferred Reading Program in Selected Los Angeles Minority Schools*, Santa Monica: The Rand Corporation, 1976.

[25] Laurence A. Dougharty and Leonard S. Klibanoff, "A Policy Analysis of the Critical Mass Concept for the Distribution of Compensatory Education Funds," AERA Paper, 1978.

[26] Anita A. Summers and Barbara L. Wolfe, "Do Schools Make a Difference?" *American Economic Review*, September, 1977, pp. 639-652.

[27] H. Warren Button, "Creating More Useable Pasts: History in the Study of Education," *Educational Researcher*, May 1979, pp. 3-9.

Oral History: Use of Interviews to Obtain a Historical Perspective of Early Childhood Education

Sherry Boyd
University of Dubuque

The hypothesis of this paper: The use of personal interviews to gather oral histories is a viable technique.

Because there has been and continues to be much debate concerning the reliability of information gathered using this technique, this paper will cite the pros and cons of using oral history. I will, therefore, reinforce existing knowledge and add to the conclusions and recommendations currently available.

BACKGROUND

Methods Used: (rationale)

As a doctoral candidate I undertook the ambitious task of piecing together the history of early childhood education from the years 1920 to 1980. The intent of my study was to interview all living past-presidents of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC) to record and analyze the historical development of early childhood education visavis the history of The Association. Consequently, the method of interviewing became the apparent method to be used.

Research Methodology: Background

Oral history, a method of historical research, was used throughout my study. Upon examination of the existing literature on oral history, it became clear to me early in my reading that there is controversy surrounding the validity of oral histories.

Moss (*Oral History Program Manual*, 1974) justifies oral histories when he writes:

> . . . one rarely finds in this fast-paced world of electronics communications those thoughtful and reflective diaries that historians often have used to provide a human counterpoint to the dominant themes of political and social development.

Even though oral history is as old as history itself, the authenticity and credibility of its historical data are often questioned. Davis, Back, and MacLean (*Oral History: From Tape to Type*, 1977) state, "Oral history is not heresay. When conscientiously gathered, carefully processed, and critically examined, it contributes modestly to the *quantity* and uniquely to the *quality* of what we know about the recent past." Oral history can fill the gaps in written documents, presenting recorded verbatim accounts and opinions which will likely interest future scholars (Moss, 1974).

The same specific questions were asked of each past-president with preparation time given for consideration of responses. Thompson (Thompson, *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*, 1978) stated, "questions should always be as simple and as straightforward as possible, in familiar language." And, all open-ended questions should allow the interviewee to "pick up the ball and run with it" (Epstein & Mendelsohn, Record and Remember, 1978). At the same time, an open inquiry should "search the memory of interviewees for historical evidence" (Moss, *Oral History Program Manual*, 1974).

Research Methodology: Procedures

As previously stated, I proposed to use personal, direct contact with leaders of The Association. Interviews with past-presidents of The Association were conducted to obtain the history of early childhood education (The Association).

The following open-ended questions were presented to the past-presidents for their responses:

1. What were the major events/concerns of early childhood educators of The Association during your presidency?
2. What societal factors (economic or political) contributed to the attitudes toward young children during your presidency?

Of particular interest were the evolving positions of The Association and implications for the future of The Association utilizing, and profiting from, the past experiences of these leaders in The Association.

Telephone interviews were used when in-person interviews were not possible. These interviews with the past-presidents of The Association recalled the social, political, and economic atmosphere of the respective periods of their presidencies. Where periods of The Association are not represented by a living past-president, Governing Board Meeting minutes and issues of The Association's journal were studied. To ensure continuity in the oral history, a summary of this information was included for the periods when past-presidents are deceased.

The actual procedure which was used for this study was as follows:

1. A letter of introduction was sent to each living past-president seeking permission to conduct the interview, as well as confirmation dates for attendance at the national conference in San Francisco. Also, a request was made for identification of areas on which the past-presidents might wish to respond.
2. If an interview was not possible at the San Francisco conference, a telephone call was made to establish a date for the telephone interview. In a very few cases, travel was possible to the residence of past-presidents for the purpose of interviewing.
3. Conducting the interview was on an individualized basis, depend-

ing on each person's circumstances. The most desirable arrangement was, of course, to meet with each past-president personally and attempting this was given the highest priority.

4. Each interview was tape recorded.
5. The interview was transcribed.
6. The past-presidents were mailed a copy of the transcript and asked to review this for errors. Enclosed with this transcript was the Agreement on Use Form (see Appendix A) to be signed, dated and returned.
7. The reviewed, returned transcript was analyzed for historical events in early childhood education via The Association.
8. As translated from the interview sessions, the history of early childhood education (The Association) was recorded, including an appendix outlining a biographical sketch of each of The Association's past-presidents.

Of the twenty-one past-presidents of the National Association for the Education of Young Children (NAEYC), fifteen were living at the time of my study.

When possible and practical, interviews were done in-person. Six were completed in this fashion. Seven past-presidents were interviewed by telephone. One person was residing in London during this study; however, he agreed to record his answers on a tape and forward it. Contact was made with the remaining past-presidents early on, but after the initial correspondence, other attempts at communication were unsuccessful.

For the purpose of my research, each interview was summarized, focusing on the past-president's comments which related directly to the two research questions.

Additions to Interviews (procedures)

To better understand the historical record of The Association, many sources were examined and analyzed. Therefore, publications, correspondence, board meeting records, and conference programs of the following associations were examined, but only as they relate to The Association and its policy and decision making: The Association for Childhood Education International (ACEI), Elementary-Kindergarten-Nursery Education (EKNE), and The Southern Association for Children under Six (SACUS).

Along with the primary source of data (taped interviews with past-presidents), other sources were consulted for background and supplementary information:

histories of early childhood education for background information

journals, books, and pamphlets pertaining to early childhood education

journals of other associations related to early childhood education correspondences

official minutes and records of The Association board meetings

legislation pertaining to young children passed during the last fifty-six years

conference programs from past national conferences of The Association

interviews with selected individuals, other than past-presidents who have worked closely with The Association

Agreement on Usefulness of "Oral" History

Researchers from different disciplines — anthropology, sociology, political science — have discovered that interviewing is a fundamental source of evidence. As Thompson states (Thompson, "Oral History and the Historian," 1983), "history based only on written sources such as letters, minutes and newspapers, would fail to grasp a very high proportion of what was important, both for everyday social and private living, and equally at the level of major political and economic decision-making."

Strengths of oral tradition commonly cited include: 1) results are less biased compared to written accounts, the oral source being less expanded and amended; 2) the results of the oral history are richer; 3) the informant is more likely to reveal information now than at the time of events; 4) information is based on direct experience; 5) oral histories are often the first representation for some groups (women, Blacks, the unorganized, families); 6) oral tradition opened history to the ordinary person; and 7) oral histories allow the rediscovery of family roots.

Skepticism Towards Interviewing

1. "Proof" by Documents:

Just as there are several possible strengths, there too are several possible weaknesses to oral history, which account for the skepticism among historians. The first possible reason for this could be found in the professional definition (slogan) "no documents, no history." Many historians are reluctant to acknowledge the treatment of an oral source as a true document. This problem of representativeness could, however, be applied to all forms of historical evidence, because all documents are *chosen* for preservation. Selections are not made in an accidental, random, cross-section fashion necessarily. Rather, selections for historical preservation ". . . reflect the power structure and prejudices of their time. . . ." (Thompson, "Oral History and the Historian," 1983).

II. Validity of Ethnic History:

A second oft-cited reason for the hesitancy to accept oral history lies in the fact that the re-evaluation and increased acceptance of oral sources since 1945 came less from pure historians and more from the "social world." The movement in other countries towards oral histories came from national and social groups which had no previous written history, for example, Africa, Asia. And in our own country, membership in labor organizations, the Black culture and womankind is now recognized.

III. Selective Recall:

A third, and most obvious limitation to pursuing an oral history is the accuracy of recollection on the part of the interviewees. Much has been written concerning this problem. Davis, Back, and MacLean (1977), Thompson (1978), and Wright (Wright, *Oral Tradition*, 1965) agree that the human memory as a source was subject to lapses, errors, fabrications, and distortions. Lack of memory brought about, indirectly, explanatory interpolations, when one recollection conflicted with another recollection.

There is little doubt that memory is selective and over the years the accuracy of memory becomes impaired. However, there is still much debate about the causes of the different types of impairments and the effects of time (long-range and short-term) on memory. Note, for instance, the results of eyewitness accounts of a crime immediately following the crime. There may exist a wide variety of recollections. So, the conflict of memory may not be exclusive to accounts from many years ago. With the exception of direct filming and recording, all documentation undergoes the selection process of memorizing. It is, therefore, wise and prudent for readers to always remember that all authors hold a "point of view" and that no account is truly without bias.

IV. Corruption/Bias by Personal Viewpoints:

Another limitation was the personality of the respondent. Moss (1974) discussed the strong restraints inhibiting the participants' free and candid participation. The importance ascribed to an event depended upon the personality of the informant (Wright, 1965). Much good information was revealed prior to the tape recorder being switched on, but that information was too confidential and/or controversial for the record. Relating also to the personality of the respondent was the willingness of the individual to share any personal papers (Clark, 1968).

All oral histories were subject to social pressures from the context in which they were obtained (Thompson, 1978). Wright (1965) believed the respondent's perception of historical events depends heavily "on the general consensus of opinion in the society." Interpretations of events/issues were dependent on the individual's own context of the situation.

Because six of the past-presidents are deceased, there was a limited representation of The Association during these periods of time. Also, one past-president initially agreed to be included in this project, but was not available following the first contact.

V. Impracticality of Tapes:

Transcription of the tape recordings creates an additional problem for this type of research. Although tape recordings are the primary documents of interviewers, they are, in many ways, a very impractical medium to use in research. Because it is essential that they be transcribed, cost for transcriptions become prohibitive. Many hours go into transcribing tape recordings: 1 hour of tape recording takes approximately six hours to transcribe. Also, because the quality of tape recordings may not be consistent, especially in my case where telephone interviews were necessary, the typist's ability to transcribe may vary greatly — to the point of inability to transcribe sections.

VI. Interpreting Oral Histories:

The final problem relates to the actual summarizing of the material. Once the material is collected, what do you do with it? There are really two possibilities. One, present the transcripts as oral documents or verbatim transcripts and allow them to stand as such. The other possibility is to attempt to incorporate them into the historical perspectus, using the information to illustrate a historical argument. Often times this can be an ardous task. In my research, I chose to do both. The edited transcripts are on file in the National Archives of The Association and these same transcripts were used to glean the historically significant events of early childhood education.

Recognizing the general limitations cited by Hopkins (Hopkins, *Educational Research: A Structure for Inquiry*, 1976) — the type of questions that can be asked, the information that can be used, and the validity of the answers derived — special attention was given to the subjectivity of the evidence (Moss, 1974; Wright, 1965). In many cases, interviewees spoke of their own concern for allowing nostalgic recollections to cloud the actual historical facts. As with any personal, first-hand account, care was given to assure a critical acceptance of the recollections (Davis, Back, and MacLean, 1977). Counter to this was the effect the unpleasant experiences had on memories.

The Board Meeting minutes of The Association were used extensively as background information for interview sessions, or, in some cases, as the sole source of historical data for certain periods that were not represented by a past-president. However, minutes were not available for the ten years between 1937 and 1947. There was no journal for The Association prior to 1945, and there was virtually no information on The Association from the years 1937 to 1945. The fate of these minutes was unknown; but speculation has it that because the country was involved in

World War II between 1939 and 1945, few Board Meetings were actually held. Also, there was no central office or staff at that time, so any minutes that were available at one time could have been lost in the mail or misplaced when moved from the outgoing to the incoming president's location.

In addition, some of the available Board Meeting minutes were either brief, unclear, or incomplete.

In-person interviews were not always possible and telephone interviews were conducted instead. Telephone interviews later proved limiting because facial gestures and body language are really cues for pursuing or discontinuing a topic of conversation. The lack of visual interaction proved a hinderance during each telephone interview.

Are Oral Histories Useful?

Conclusions resulting from my research include:

1. Information gathered from informants may include inaccuracies.
2. Information is dependent on interviewee's personality. (shy, "super ego")
3. Oral histories are subject to the pressures of the social context.
4. Recreation of time periods is difficult without representation by an interviewee.
5. In-person interviews are definitely preferable.
6. Recollections of concerns and/or events are less difficult and more detailed when recollections are made soon after involvement.

Recommendations

Because of the enormity of the task of collecting transient historical data, my recommendation here is for a consistent, continued effort in collection of oral histories. I would hasten to add, however, that oral histories be recognized for what they are or can be: vivid, personal, detailed accounts, utilizing a particular and local turn of a phrase. For this to happen, enough time must be allowed for responses, keeping in mind the age of respondents. Further, allowances need to be made for inaccurate recollections of the interviewee.

To alleviate some of the confusion of the interviewee, it is helpful to present the interviewee with questions beforehand, allowing adequate time for preparation of answers. I also encouraged informants to bring along any notes to help jog their memories while the tape recorder was running. Also, transcripts should be checked for internal consistency. Has the informant been consistent with chronology of events, approximate dates, etc.? Evaluation of oral testimony should also be done in comparison with evidence from other sources. This can be particularly time-consuming, but unavoidable nonetheless.

I further recommend that thought be given to choosing interviewees. Selection of informants can be done because they are people of special interest: possessing full memories, life experiences were exceptional, or they were critical to the question under study. The other reason for selecting informants is because of their membership in a wider social order. The goal here is to strive for a balance of perspectives. Because death strikes unevenly within groups of people (more men than women, for example), there is a need for a quota system to be established to reach this balance of perspectives.

An additional recommendation deals with any original budgets for research involving oral histories. As stated earlier, costs for transcriptions of tape recordings are high. Careful consideration should be given to this when deciding expenses.

My final recommendation is that any editing of tape recordings be done judiciously. If you recall, my study called for editing by the interviewee. Unfortunately, some informants removed the "heart" of the interview when given this privilege and a lot of the flavor of the interview was lost as a result. Because some of my returned, edited transcriptions were barely recognizable from the original transcriptions, I would give informants specific guidelines as to what is acceptable editing, for example clarifying people's names or any inaccurate information the informant detects from editing.

Much can be gained from oral histories. With proper awareness and caution, research using this technique can prove valuable.

Appendix A

AGREEMENT ON USE
(Epstein & Mendelsohn, 1978)

I, _____, give permission to Sherry Boyd to use any tapes, transcripts, and biographical information from this interview for historical, scholarly, or educational purposes, including publication, lecture, or archival storage.

_____
(date)

Suggested Readings

Clark, G.K. *Guide for Research Students Working on Historical Subjects*. 2d. ed. Cambridge: University Press, 1968.

Davis, Cullomm Kathryn Back and Kay MacLean. *Oral History from Tape to Type*. Chicago: American Library Association, 1977.

Epstein, E.R., and R. Mendelsohn. *Record and Remember*. New York: Sovereign Books, 1978.

Hopkins, Charles D. *Educational Research: A Structure for Inquiry*. Columbus: Charles E. Merrill Publishing Company, 1976.

Moss, William W. *Oral History Program Manual*. New York: Praeger Publishers, 1974.

Thompson, Paul. "Oral History and the Historian." *History Today*, 33 (June, 1983), 24-28.

Thompson, Paul. *The Voice of the Past: Oral History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1978.

UNESCO "Oral Tradition: Deep Well of African History." *UN Chronicle*, 14 (July, 1982), 85-86.

Wright, H.M., trans., *Oral Tradition*, by Jan Vansina. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1965.

144

PART V

Some Perspectives on Higher Education

The Americanization of Higher Learning

Egal Feldman
University of Wisconsin-Superior

The purpose of this discussion is three-fold: first, to trace some key elements which make up the foundations of American higher learning; secondly, to identify those elements which might be considered indigenous to American culture and those which have entered into American education from abroad; and finally to suggest how the contemporary crisis in American higher learning is related to tensions between these elements.

The Role of the Church

The New England essayist, Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, described the American university in 1829 as consisting of "two or three large brick buildings with a chapel, and a President to pray in it."[1] Although remote from our own sensibilities, his comment underscores what I see as the first indigenous element in American higher education: the church. I will not belabor this point except to say that before the Revolution, eight American universities were already designed to achieve two principle objectives: to train Christian ministers to represent the already numerous denominations that inhabited the American colonies, and to counteract Deism and other dangerous tendencies.[2] Even after the birth of the United States, and throughout the 19th century, and despite the principle of Separation of Church and State, sectarian state-supported institutions dedicated themselves to producing, if not ministers, than "Christians." And as America pushed westward, denominations vied with one another to establish educational outposts of faith in the unchurched frontier. If numbers mean anything, they were successful.[3]

Emphasis on Growth

In 1880, the President of Barnard College raised an interesting question. He wondered why England, with a population of 23 million, managed well with three colleges, while the State of Ohio, with a population of 3 million, supported thirty-seven.[4] This question brings to mind a second indigenous and enduring element in the make-up of American higher education: the tendency to multiply and expand.

What propelled Americans to build so many colleges? Obviously, the size of the United States and the spread of distances between populated communities acted as a powerful inducement; as did the American emphasis on the principle of states' rights. By placing the educational agenda exclusively in the hands of each state, the proliferation of colleges was further encouraged.

Neither did it take long for Americans to learn that erecting colleges

was good for business. As Professor Daniel Boorstin observes, city boosters and real estate brokers discovered that the presence of a college enhanced the sale of real estate in fledgling Western cities. In some cases the college, more often referred to as a "university," erected for the primary purpose of attracting a population, and enhancing land value, preceded the founding of a town. Unlike Europe, where colleges were established in ancient centers of population — Paris, Rome, Prague — in the United States they were planted in the wilderness and were expected to create cities around them.[5]

Nineteenth Century American millionaires also played a role by contributing their fortunes to build universities. Before the Civil War, it was rare for a university to receive a gift in excess of three or four thousand dollars. But in the latter years of the century, Leland Stanford gave $20,000,000 to build Stanford, and John D. Rockefeller established the University of Chicago with a grant of $30,000,000. Such generous gifts added to the notion that more and bigger is better.[6]

Poor Quality

Until the end of the nineteenth century, academic standards left much to be desired. Poor quality may be added as a third indigenous ingredient of American higher learning.

The proliferation of American colleges carried a major responsibility for the deterioration of quality. The multiplying denominational institutions, rivaling each other for students, were especially weak. Phillip Lindsley, pioneer President of the University of Nashville, complained in 1834 of the evils of sectarian rivalry. Few universities " 'are what they might and should be,' " he wrote, " 'and the greater part of them are mere impositions upon the public. . . . Must every State be divided and subdivided into as many college associations as there are religious sects within its limits?' " asked Lindsley, " 'And thus, by their mutual jealousy and distrust effectually prevent the usefulness and prosperity of any one institution?' "[7]

A lack of fiscal resources had a direct impact on quality. With so many colleges competing with each other it was difficult to finance higher education. The primary function of a college president throughout a good portion of the 19th century was to raise funds. An annual "begging tour" became his major responsibility.

Despite their numbers, colleges were far from popular prior to the Twentieth century. Before 1840, only 11 American institutions, and most of them in the East, enrolled more than 150 students. Libraries were puny. By 1800, Harvard, already in existence a century and a half, possessed only 11,000 books; Yale, a little more than 5,000; Princeton, less than that, and these were the largest.[8]

The current tendency to look nostalgically at the old classical curricu-

lum when undergraduates, it was believed, were reared on *Horace, Demosthenes, Cicero,* and *Tacitus*, indicates little historical imagination. Such classics were not studied critically but were taught as tedious exercises in grammar. The late Richard Hoffstadter observes that it is rare to discover a flattering comment from students about their 19th century college experience. Although good, even brilliant, minds emerged from the system, they were accidents, resulting not because of their education, but in spite of it.[9]

Prior to 1920, it was neither gratifying nor useful to go to college. A college degree was not necessary for success in most professions. Andrew Carnegie, America's most articulate entrepreneur of the nineteenth century, advised young men not to attend college, which he believed was a total waste of time. The enrollments of some of the largest liberal arts colleges in 1900 underscores a public indifference to higher learning. Harvard had only 2,720 students, Michigan, 1,770, Wisconsin, 1,617, Minnesota, 1,567, and Illinois, 913.[10]

Emphasis on Applied Knowledge

A major element in the weakness of American higher learning was its preponderant emphasis on applied rather than theoretical or basic research. As we had seen, the first colleges in America were designed to achieve a defined objective; that is, to produce ministers and missionaries, not young men interested in the sciences, humanities, arts or the free pursuit of truth.

As the United States grew geographically and industrially in the 19th century, it sought out and offered its greatest rewards to doers, not thinkers. Its heroes were lawyers like Daniel Webster and John C. Calhoun, who could tinker with and manipulate the Constitution; engineers and inventors, like Robert Fulton, Cyrus McCormick, Thomas Edison, or Henry Ford, not scientists. Higher learning reflected this tendency towards applied rather than theoretical knowledge, and must also be included among the indigenous American characteristics of higher learning. Alexis de Tocqueville was first to identify this tendency.

> "Men who live in democratic communities," he wrote in 1828, "not only seldom indulge in meditation but they naturally entertain very little esteem for it. [In the United States] men are generally led to attach an excessive value to the rapid bursts and superficial conceptions of the intellect, and on the other hand to undervalue unduly its slow and deeper labors."[11]

Indeed, 19th century Americans looked suspiciously at theoretical learning. President John Quincy Adams, who once jeopardized his political career by proposing a national university, made another fatal error: he spent his summer vacations in Washington working on mathematical tables. His constituents found this strange. Fishing in the Brule would have been politically wiser. It seems that President Andrew Jackson learned from his predecessor, when he declined to accept an honorary doctorate offered to him by Harvard University. Jackson was

convinced it would hurt his image.[12] The title "Professor" contained a humorous, almost ridiculous connotation in American society, and was more readily attributed to a "master of a flea circus" or a "weight lifter in a side show."[13]

Prior to World War I, students interested in the pursuit of theoretical knowledge were compelled to study abroad. Research of any kind was discouraged. Faculty were not expected to discover new knowledge but to familiarize their students with what was already known. As Professor Charles L. Newcomb, one of the few prominent American scientists and an insightful critic of higher learning lamented in 1888:

> " 'The American public has no adequate appreciation of the superiority of original research to simple knowledge. It is too prone to look upon great intellectual efforts as mere *tours de force*, worthy of more admiration than the feats of the gymnist, but not half so amusing, and no more in need of public support.' "[14]

Theoretical Learning and Basic Research

All this is not to say that American higher education did not encompass within it also a yearning for theoretical inquiry and knowledge. The presence of Newcomb himself, not to mention such thinkers as James Pierce, William James, John Dewey, and others, suggest strongly that great minds were not totally absent from the American academy. Indeed, an interest in theoretical and basic research did exist in the United States, but, and this is the point I wish to stress, it formed an uncomfortable partnership with the other elements which I have described. As I see it, this latter ingredient constituted an alien element in higher learning which entered the United States from abroad via three intellectual invasions and was never firmly rooted in the American soil. I would like to say a word about each of these "invasions."

The first was the European movement known as the "Enlightenment." It made rational thinking about the universe acceptable, secularized society, challenged the authority of the church and its dogmas, and encouraged scientific thinking and experimentation in all areas of knowledge. In the process, it changed the character of the American university. During its heyday, in the latter half of the 18th century, American scientists, most of them amateurs, achieved international respectability. Popular enthusiasm for speculative thinking was underscored by the suspension of even the American Revolutionary War to allow a few scientists into British territory to observe a total eclipse of the sun. A few years later, the debates of the Constitutional Convention in Philadelphia were also tabled to allow a discussion of the possible application of Newtonian principles.[15] By the beginning of the 19th century, however, this burst of interest in theoretical thinking and scientific experimentation declined, as it was superceeded by a rising interest in applied learning.

The second invasion resulted from the theories of the Englishman

Charles Darwin. Darwinian thinking proved very popular in late 19th century America, and was soon translated into social formulas which influenced every aspect of life, including the American curriculum, where evolutionary thought left its imprint, not only upon biologists and geologists, but social scientists and humanists as well.

Like the Enlightenment, evolutionary thinking further secularized society, weakened the church's hold upon education, and raised scientific learning to a higher level of respectability. Lester Ward and William Graham Sumner, leading exponents of social Darwinism, introduced the subject of sociology into American education. Historical as well as religious and philosophical studies also received new vitality through the evolutionary emphasis.[16] By the end of the last century, the American university was in a stronger position than it had ever been before, although the proponents of the new learning were still too few in number to create an enduring impression.

The third invasion came during the 1930's and 1940's, as a direct result of the rise of Fascism and Nazism, movements which crippled many of the major continental universities. With the arrival into the United States of hundreds of refugee scholars expelled by totalitarian regimes, American higher learning underwent another transformation. The United States was fortunate to receive numerous brilliant minds, whose impact was shortly felt in every area: Eric Fromm and T.W. Adorno in Psychoanalysis and Social Psychology; Bruno Walter in Music; Thomas Mann in Literature; Paul Tillich in Theology; Albert Einstein in Physics, to name but a few of the giants. Together they injected a badly needed stimulus into the American intellectual scene and brought international pre-eminence to American higher learning.

Ironically, Europe discarded these scholars because of their commitment to theoretical, not practical or applied learning. To the Nazi and Fascist mind, knowledge which did not lead directly to the enhancement of military and economic power was deemed useless, if not subversive. Theoretical physics was ridiculed by the Nazis as "Jewish Physics." Fortunately, a handful of American professors, with the aid of such organizations as the AAUP, despite the depression of the 1930's and a growing army of unemployed faculty, exerted heroic efforts to transport this handful of talented scholars to the United States. It was a great achievement and was in large part responsible for the post-World War II triumph of American higher learning.[17]

Conclusion

What conclusions can we draw from all this? I have attempted to show that American higher learning includes within it indigenous and alien elements. Together they form a synthesis which is mirrored in the American curriculum, but these elements have also planted seeds for conflict and tension in the American academy, especially in regard to its mission and direction.

In recent years, once again, increasing emphasis has been placed upon the importance of applied learning. Public support for basic research in science, in the social sciences, and in the humanities has declined. Some years ago, Robert Nisbet raised the intriguing question: "Are universities necessary?" The question, relevant for this discussion, has an ominous logic. After all, a society which stresses applied learning could surely uncover less expensive ways to deliver knowledge to its citizens. There are hospitals, churches, police departments, mental health clinics, business corporations, that can be successfully harnassed, to the delight of taxpayers, for the task of teaching. There is nothing inherently sacred or eternal about the university. As Nisbet notes, "History is filled with degrees, titles, ranks, and diplomas that were once thought to be important, but that became in due time — after their functional importance had disappeared — mere curiousities and relics for the amusement of later generations."[18]

In short, the university, as we know it, can survive only if society continues to believe that the former alone is capable of performing certain unique and distinctive functions which no other institution — neither church, media, mental health clinic, nor any other corporate body — can duplicate. Should this conviction erode, the majesty of the university will erode with it.[19] The durability of American higher learning thus remains linked to society's willingness to provide an environment where teaching, learning, and basic research are valued as precious commodities for their own sake. Unfortunately, as I have noted above, this latter requirement has never sat too comfortably in the American milieu.

Notes

[1] Quoted in, Richard Hofstadter, "The Revolution in Higher Education," in Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Morton White, eds., *Paths of American Thought* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963), p. 271.

[2] Frederick, Rudolph, *The American College and University: A History* (New York: Alfred A. Knopp, 1962), pp. 3-7, 16-18.

[3] Daniel J. Boorstin, *The Americans: The National Experience* (New York: Random House, 1965), pp. 153-160. The first printed schedule of classes for the newly founded New York University, a "non-sectarian" institution, in 1832 indicates a heavy emphasis on religious and sectarian courses. The Facsimile is in the possession of author.

[4] Boorstin, p. 155; Rudolph, pp. 48-58.

[5] Boorstin, pp. 155-158, 163.

[6] Hofstadter, p. 275.

[7] Quoted in Boorstin, p. 154.

[8] Hofstadter, pp. 272-73.

[9] Ibid., pp. 270-71.

[10] Edwin E. Slosson, *Great American Universities* (New York: Arno Press, 1977 edition), p. 479.

[11] Alexis de Tocqueville, *Democracy in America*, Vol. II (New York: Vintage Books, 1954 edition), p. 44; see also, Perry Miller, *The Life of the Mind in America from the Revolution to the Civil War* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc., 1965), pp. 287-291.

[12] Eliot Morison and Henry Steel Commager, *The Growth of the American Republic*, I (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), pp. 462, 464; John William Ward, Andrew Jackson, *Symbol for an Age* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1962), p. 83.

[13] I. Bernard Cohen, "Science in America: the Nineteenth Century," in Arthur M. Schlesinger, Jr., and Morton White, eds. *Paths of American Thought* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1963), p. 183.

[14] Quoted in ibid., p. 185.

[15] Ibid., p. 170.

[16] Rudolph, pp. 340-47.

[17] For an extended discussion of this topic see Donald Fleming and Bernard Bailyn, editors, *The Intellectual Migration: Europe and America, 1930-1960* (Cambridge, MA: Charles Warren Center for Studies in American History, 1968).

[18] In this connection see Robert Nisbet's perceptive discussion in "The Future of the University," *Commentary*, Vol. 61 (February, 1971), p. 70.

[19] *Ibid.*, p. 68.

Life and Death of An Agricultural College

William Eaton and Michael Bond
Southern Illinois University, Carbondale

One of the historical oversights perpetuated by American history textbooks is to continue to develop the theme of the spectacular growth of industrialization in the nineteenth century without parallel emphasis upon the equally spectacular and necessary revolution in American agriculture. The whirl of flywheels, the hissing of monstrous steam engines, and the shrill whistles of chugging iron locomotives attack our historically poised eyes, and nose, and ears but should be rightfully balanced with the more quiet subleties of hybrid seed, steel plows able to cut the prairie, and the wonder of woven barbed-wire.

Illinois was in the middle of the agricultural revolution. Blessed with an abundance of rich farm land and its fair share of talented and inventive people, the state would emerge as a giant in the production of corn, soybeans, cattle, and pigs. Record harvests of one year seemed modest when compared with the results of the following year. Illinois held center stage in an area that was to later be proclaimed as "America's Breadbasket."

The facts of this agricultural revolution were not lost on that band of hearty souls called venture capitalists. There were fortunes to be made in building the latest reaper or seed planter, in investing in the rising value of farm lands, in building processing plants that ground corn, slaughtered beef, rendered hogs, or in gambling on such uncontrollable elements as the weather or the corn bore in order to speculate on grain futures. But if money could be made from agricultural land or in agricultural bounty, why not in agricultural education?

Thomas Quick was a lawyer who lived in the tiny hamlet of Irvington, Illinois. By 1860 he had conceived of an entrepreneural scheme of creating a private agricultural college. Start-up costs, though, would be a problem. The solution — get the state to underwrite the venture. Thus began one of the most ambitious and bizarre enterprises ever supported by the State of Illinois, the creation of a purely profit motive college of agriculture.

In 1861 the city of Chicago was growing by nearly geometric proportions and the state capital had shifted from Vandalia in the south-central portion of the state to Springfield, following the state's demographic undulations. Still, southern Illinois, the original settlement portion of the state, was not without influence. Thomas Quick, and his associates, capitalized on that influence and had introduced into the Illinois General Assembly a bill which would create a private-entrepreneural college of agriculture entitled to the full use of the state's Seminary Lands still unsold as of 1861.

The Act to incorporate the Illinois Agricultural College and to give it

the remaining Seminary Lands passed the Illinois House of Representatives on February 16 and the Illinois Senate on February 21, 1861. The charter established a private corporation organized by Thomas Quick, J.W. Singleton, William Hacher, William Buchannan, B.C. Ronois, Harmon Alexander, Curtis Blakeman, James H. Stipp, and Zadok Casey. Stock was to be offered to the public at $100 a share. The corporation was empowered to sell, rent, or lease the Seminary lands which amounted to 2,919 acres located in Cook and Iroquois Counties. In return for the state's beneficence, the board of directors of the corporation was to issue a full biennial report to the legislature and to instruct free of charge one student from each county of the state on an annual basis.[1]

The state charter stipulated that the location of the college and its farms be located south of a line dividing the state in half. The actual location would depend upon the decision of the corporation. This, then, meant that the decision would be in the hands of the principal stockholders. Local "boosterism," so common throughout the nineteenth century, caused delegations of various county officials to inquire about stock purchases hoping to control enough shares to insure the location of the new college in their own communities. But before these interests could organize, Thomas Quick offered the shares for sale on the morning of May 6, 1861 at Richview in Washington County.

The charter stated that following the sale of the first $25,000 of shares, a general meeting could be called, and corporate officers could be elected. Upon opening the sale, Quick announced that he and a few of his friends had already bought $25,300 of stock laying down the 10% cash required. By day's end, Quick, who held the power of attorney for all of his friends, had called a meeting of stockholders, elected a board of directors, held a meeting of the board, elected himself President, and had decided to locate the college at Irvington in Washington County, Illinois.[2] Beethoven would have applauded such fine orchestration!

Alexander D. Hay, as the new secretary-treasurer of the board, began selling the Seminary Lands. He sold 2,279 acres for $56,110 which works out to $24.62 an acre. One tract of 640 acres located in Iroquois County was left unsold. The money from these sales was, by the original charter, to be placed in an endowment fund.[3] The money subscribed by stockholders was to provide the capital for the purchase of land and the construction of the college buildings and its model farm.[4]

Irvington was a village of 300 in southern Illinois advantaged by relatively good soil and its placement on the Illinois Central Railroad main line about seven miles south of Centralia. Land for the college was purchased in 1864 for $4,000 on a plot laying adjacent to the rail line bearing the legal description of Township One South, Range One West of the Third Principal Meridian, Section Fourteen.[5] Later, another 40 acres were purchased bringing the amount of land owned by the college to 560 acres when its doors opened in 1866. Nearly five full years were spent by the corporation in readying the campus.

On the 3rd of September, 1866, the Centralia *Sentinel* heralded the opening of the Illinois Agricultural College which was to occur one week from that day. The faculty of five consisted of the Reverend I.S. Mahan, A.M., Professor of natural sciences, agriculture, and English literature; the Reverend James C. Finley, A.M., M.D., Professor of agricultural chemistry, horticulture, intellectual and moral philosophy; Mr. Valentine C. Rucker, B.S., Professor of mathematics, bookkeeping, and commercial law; Mrs. Helen Keeny, A.M., Professor of botany, drawing and painting; and Mr. Peter Walser, L.L.D., Professor of music, German, and French. A search for an eminent educator to serve as president of the college had not been successful. The promise of a $3,000 a year salary proved insufficient to attract the likes of Jonathan Baldwin Turner, John Gregory, and Newton Bateman, to whom, among others, the position was offered. To come to such a remote location, for a school with a small endowment, so few students, and with such an uncertain future, did not attract worthy applicants.

The board's creative solution to this dilemma was to offer the job of president to anyone who would take it provided that they lease the college and its lands for five years from the board of directors, leaving the endowment untouched, receiving no salary, but being entitled to all surplus tuition and the proceeds from the sale of grain and fruit grown on the college's farm. This offer was accepted by the Reverend D.P. French, former President of Almira College.[6] The board hoped that by the end of five years the struggling enterprise would be on its feet and that a president of national prominence could be attracted.

By the time of the college's opening in 1866, the campus consisted of two main buildings, a classroom building and a dormitory, constructed at a cost of $35,000 with an additional $9,000 worth of barns, fencing, and furniture.[7] The price of board was set at $40 a term for students with the college providing the room, a stove, a bed and mattress.[8] The first students were busied with preparing strawberry beds, planting grape vines and blackberry bushes, laying out fruit trees, and readying the fields. This preparatory work, certainly crucial to the future of the model farm, was, however, no quick route to riches. The board met at the end of the year and declared the academic term a financial disaster. Things would get worse in rapid succession. Recruiting students to this life of unremitting toil proved difficult. Low enrollment meant that only a portion of the total farm land could be cultivated, thus limiting the financial return. And in 1868 the wheat crop failed. Surplus lands rented out to nearby farmers provided a very small return.[9] And if these things weren't bad enough, the state of Illinois had committed itself to a competitor, the University of Illinois at Urbana.

Agricultural leaders in Illinois had been fighting for a state supported college of agriculture since the 1850s. The example of Michigan was duly noted and efforts at lobbying for a similar institution in Illinois were put into action. The state's financial position diverted the efforts of the agricultural and industrial lobby to Washington where the idea of releas-

ing federal lands to the states for their sale in support of public agricultural and mechanical arts schools was gaining momentum. In 1854, the Illinois General Assembly approved a resolution asking for federal assistance in such a plan and it was introduced by James Shields, Illinois' junior senator.[10] Illinois' senior senator, the honorable Stephen A. Douglas, was presumably too busy with matters such as holding the union together with his Kansas-Nebraska Act to participate in these preliminary efforts.

Though Illinois agricultural and industrial leaders are credited with early and important efforts on behalf of federal intervention, the major credit is reserved for Senator Justin Morrill of Vermont. He introduced the Land-Grant College Act in 1857 only to have it reported back unfavorably by the Committee on Public Lands. He re-introduced the bill in 1858 but it failed in the House. That same year he tried again and it passed the House only to fail in the Senate. Undaunted, Morrill introduced it again in 1859 and successfully ushered it through Committee, got the House and Senate to approve it only to see President Buchanan veto it.[11]

Jonathan Baldwin Turner, leader of Illinois' agricultural lobby, now took steps to insure the passage of the Land-Grant measure. Illinois enjoyed the peculiar distinction of having the two principal presidential candidates from its state, Abraham Lincoln and Stephen Douglas. Turner caught Lincoln at the state nominating convention at Decatur and Douglas on a train traveling to Peoria. By the time he was through with them, both had promised to sign a Land-Grant College bill if elected president.[12]

The eventual passage of the Morrill Act in 1862 didn't mean automatic death for private agricultural schools though. The example of Cornell receiving New York State's land-grant monies had to offer at least small encouragement to the entrepreneurs at Irvington. The central problem for the incorporators was that events were moving too fast. The debate as to how to distribute the money and where to locate a state institution were taking place before Illinois Agricultural College had opened its doors. Even after opening, the beginnings were so shaky that it was difficult for the incorporators to elicit sympathetic supporters. The best they could manage was a strategy devised with a Chicago contingent calling for the separation of educational functions which would have placed the industrial portion of the new university in Chicago, the agricultural division at Irvington, and the general education curriculum at Urbana. This plan, slightly desperate at that, did not succeed. In 1870 the cornerstone of a unified Illinois Industrial Institute was laid at Urbana. The incorporators of the Illinois Agricultural College at Irvington had to believe that their survival was now at great risk. The resources of the state were too vast. But even if they did, history is spared the record of their forebodings and they stumbled ahead.

The curriculum at Irvington, open to both men and women, was a four-

year program with the customary preparatory school for those not ready to assume freshman status. Though there was a smattering of liberal studies like grammar, history, mathematics, and moral philosophy, most of the courses reflected practical concerns. Students were required to take surveying, agriculture, geology, mineralogy, botany, vegetable physiology, chemistry, entomology, horticulture, stock raising, animal physiology, and civil engineering.[13] To make it appear as a highly eligible candidate for the Morrill Act monies, compulsory military instruction was begun and a wagonmaker from the village was induced to teach courses in mechanical arts. Tuition for preparatory students was $7.00 a term. Regular students were charged $9.00 a term. For those of a more classical bent, additional instruction could be obtained in Latin, Greek, or Hebrew for an additional $6.00 per subject. A special set of courses on pedagogy was also planned. This truly was to be the school for all seasons.

Interestingly, a look at the early student rosters reveals that almost half were women. Of the eight students on County scholarships in 1869, four were women. Total enrollment for that school year was 130, 80% of whom were in the regular college course and 20% of whom were in the Preparatory Department.[14] But the figure of 130 is misleading because it does not represent full time equivalency.

With his five-year contract at an end, the Reverend D.P. French stepped down in 1871 in favor of the Reverend A.C. Hillman who served until 1874. Hillman was replaced by the Reverend D.W. Phillips who served as college president from 1874 to the school's closing in 1879.[15]

State legislators had been receiving reports of improprieties at Irvington for several years but the first sign of official troubles for the college came in 1869 when the corporation failed to submit its biennial report to the legislature. An investigating committee was organized, inspected the premises, and made an unfavorable report. They had traveled to Irvington to see a college and had found instead, a house of cards. In 1871, the Illinois General Assembly passed a joint resolution instructing the Attorney General to dissolve the corporation and to recover the endowment. The state offered its bill of particulars to the Washington County Circuit Court, but it was dismissed. Again with the direction of the legislature, the Attorney General, appealed to the State Supreme Court which ordered a trial. The state charged that the directors had failed to provide adequate means for teaching scientific agriculture, had erected no workshops, and had no facilities for teaching mechanical arts.[16] The library was also thought inadequate though board president Thomas Quick had always insisted that his personal library of 500 volumes was at the disposal of the students. His home was located about a mile from the dormitory.

The specific charges leveled by the state were aimed at proving that the original charter had been violated so that it could be withdrawn. The financial situation was far more involved and would require several years

to unravel. The state was sure that malfeasance and irresponsibility were provable, but specific criminal charges were difficult to formulate. And, the various presidents of the college and the faculty had continued to offer instruction and were not involved in the schemes of the board.

The financial mess stemmed from the fact that the original stock subscription was too small and that even that amount had dribbled in as subscribers paid for their stock on installment. School lands and buildings had been purchased and constructed with bank credit. The bankers had been led to believe that the endowment secured the loans, which by the charter, it was not supposed to do. Through creative financing, interest payments were made by using the return from the endowment fund with only small amounts being applied toward the principal of these loans. As even this treacherous mode of operation became insufficient, lands paid for were mortgaged. It was further announced that A.D. Hay, the corporate secretary-treasurer, had declared personal bankruptcy and that $6,000 of corporation money under his care was unaccounted for. He had not been bonded. Legislative investigators were also staggered when Thomas Quick presented claims against the corporation for $15,000 for "personal services" rendered but never collected.[17]

All of these events and scandals were gleefully reported by the *Prairie Farmer* magazine and attracted widespread attention. The *Prairie Farmer*, well disposed to agricultural education, had grown disgusted at the machinations in Irvington.

The final disposition of the trial came in April of 1878 when a Washington County Circuit Court Jury ordered the lands of the Illinois Agricultural College seized and returned to the state. The General Assembly revoked the charter in May of 1879 and the State Auditor auctioned the land at a public sale. Following the liquidation, creditors, chief among them unpaid faculty, lined up to receive their due. The remaining amount of $8,913.84 was returned to the state's Seminary Fund.[18]

Following the close of the college, the buildings were used as a private school for a time and then abandoned. They were finally occupied from 1907 to 1936 by the Baptist Hudelson Children's Home. After 1936 the site remained unoccupied. Later the building was razed.[19]

What motives can we attribute to Mr. Thomas Quick and the principal stockholders of the Illinois Agricultural College? Was the plan pure and simply a scam? Probably not, Quick and his associates, at the very least, did hope to make a profit and, in the process, raise the value of the land of the region. For Quick, whose lands were contiguous to the college, this would have been of paramount importance. And yet, there seems to be motives of local boosterism as well. Quick was hardly the operator of a shell game. He was a recognized lawyer and local farmer. He was in Irvington when the college opened, he was there when it was closed.

What about the students? This is a more difficult assessment. Records

and published remembrances have proven difficult to come by. The scandal and infamy attached to the institution prevented the sort of eulogies from former students that we would expect to find about an alma mater. And yet, though there is evidence of poorly equipped laboratories, unpaid and disgruntled faculty, and grand plans that went unrealized, we cannot assume that no learning took place. For such conditions characterized most small colleges of that era.

What lessons can be gleaned from this episode of Illinois Agricultural College? For one thing, it would appear that private philanthropic or religious denominational colleges were hazardous enough — private profit institutions were simply doomed to fail. The exception to this rule would be a few of the business and commercial colleges founded in the final quarter of the nineteenth century. It would also seem that the state learned a lesson — if you are going to give away resources — demand control! Everyone, who we know, assures us that the state learned that lesson well!

Notes

[1] Illinois, Twenty-second General Assembly, "Act to Provide for the Disposition of Seminary Lands and to Incorporate the Illinois Agricultural College, State Archives, #7764, Box 174 (1861).

[2] Illinois, Twenty-sixth General Assembly, "Bills, Resolutions, and Related General Assembly Records and Proceedings of Joint Proceedings or Joint Investigation of Illinois Agricultural College, Irvington, 1869."

[3] Illinois, House, "Report of Committee on Education Who Inquired into the Rights and Interests of the State in the Illinois Agricultural College," 29th General Assembly, Journal 2, April 1875, p. 585.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] Grantor to Grantee Record Book, Washington County, Illinois, 1864.

[6] *Prairie Farmer*, "Illinois Agricultural College at Irvington," 20 June, 1968, p. 393.

[7] Illinois, Senate, "Report of a Special Committee to Examine into the Management of the Illinois Agricultural College," 26th General Assembly, 1869 Senate Miscellaneous, p. 8.

[8] Centralia *Sentinel*, 3 September, 1966.

[9] Illinois, 26th General Assembly, "Bills, Resolutions . . ." pp. 45-9.

[10] Mary Turner Carriel, *The Life of Jonathan Baldwin Turner*, published by the author, 1911, p. 153.

[11] *Ibid.*, p. 159.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] Illinois Agricultural College, Catalogue.

[14] From the papers of George H. French, Southern Illinois University Archives.

[15] *Washington County, Illinois History*. Washington County Historical Society, 1980.

[16] Burt Powell, *University of Illinois Semi-Centennial History*, Vol. 1, Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1918, pp. 174-5.

[17] *Ibid*. See also the "Report of a Special Committee Appointed to Examine Into the Management of the Illinois Agricultural College," State Archives.

[18] *Ibid*.

[19] *This is Washington County, 1818-1968*, "Sesquicentennial Committee of the Historical Society of Washington County, Illinois," 1968, p. 59.

From Principal Teacher to Corporate Manager: An Institutional History of Change In the Role of the College President

Robert Newton Barger
Eastern Illinois University

Earl James McGrath has documented the sharp decline between 1890 and 1933 in the number of college presidents who actually engaged in teaching while serving as president.[1] Indeed, it has become a truism that the role of the college president has changed drastically over the past century. This study seeks to examine some of the variables that have been responsible for this change. In particular, it will examine the variables of institutional mission, enrollment size, governance, faculty characteristics, and presidential perspective.

A case study approach will be used here, tracing the history of a school founded for a special purpose to its present status as a multi-purpose university. In the process of this tracing, an examination will be made of the roles of the five men who have been its president.

Livingston C. Lord

In 1895, the Illinois General Assembly passed an act to establish Eastern Illinois State Normal School "to qualify teachers for the common schools of this State."[2] The act provided for a five member Board of Trustees to govern the institution. This Board eventually decided to situate the School in Charleston. Samuel M. Inglis, the Illinois State Superintendent of Public Instruction was appointed in April of 1898 to be the first president, but he died about a month and a half later. In December of 1898, Livingston C. Lord, who was the head of the Normal School in Moorhead, Minnesota, was appointed to succeed Inglis — beginning what was to be a thirty-four year tenure as President of Eastern. Lord is generally regarded today as the de facto first President of Eastern. However, in keeping with the tradition of the time that the heads of schools below the collegiate level were called "principal teacher" instead of "president," Mr. Lord was known as the School's Principal until it became a teachers college in 1921.

The School opened in September of 1899 with 240 students and a staff of eighteen teachers. Lord carried on most of the administration of the school during the early years, assisted only by a teaching Registrar and a teaching Librarian. His archival papers indicate that he dealt with such things as teacher and administrator recommendations, credit transfer decisions, requests for catalogs, hiring of teachers, building construction, ordering of supplies, requests for housing, requests to speak at school commencements, and the tracking down of textbooks overdue at the textbook library.[3] A combined position of Business manager and secretary was finally created in 1921 to relieve Lord of some of these

responsibilities.

Despite these administrative duties, however, Lord considered himself primarily a teacher. He held frequent faculty meetings with his staff. Charles Coleman, who wrote the first history of Eastern, reports: "Any teacher who served under Mr. Lord will testify that his pedagogical lectures in teachers meeting amounted to a course in teaching methods equalled by few, if any, formal courses in a college or university."[4]

Thomas H. Briggs, an Eastern teacher of English, reports that Lord also actively supervised teachers:

> Those beginners who were inept he visited often, sitting through recitation after recitation, pointing out afterwards bad habits that lower accomplishment, discussing flaws in thinking, false evaluations of students' work, of bungling, ineffectual presentation of ideas. Teachers who could not, with all his help, learn to teach, caused him more anxiety than all his other administrative problems.[5]

Lord carried out what was perhaps his most influential instructional role in his conduct of the daily chapel exercises. In this regard Briggs states:

> No one who ever had the privilege of attending the "chapel" exercises every morning can ever forget the education that he got there — an education, I often thought, more important than that in the classrooms. Often he [Lord] read from authors as profound as William James, as subtle as Oliver Wendell Holmes, and as entertaining as Josephine Dodge Daskam. His taste was catholic, but always sound. Often at the chapel he talked, presenting with vigor his philosophy of life as well as of education.[6]

There was never any question of who was required to attend chapel. Everyone from the first graders in the Model School through the members of the Normal faculty was expected to be there. As Lord said in a letter to the president of Illinois State Normal University:

> Our teachers are just as much expected to be in attendance at our morning exercises as they are expected to take off their hats while teaching classes. A failure to meet one expectation would cause as great consternation on my part as failure to meet the other.[7]

Besides his supervision of teachers and his direction of chapel exercises, Lord was also involved in direct classroom instruction. In the early days of the school he taught every freshman and sophomore at some time during the year, in psychology and school management classes. Lord enjoyed teaching and continued to instruct his own classes even in his later years.[8] In August, 1931, just before his eightieth birthday, he was invited to give a course of lectures to normal school presidents and other executives at Teachers College, Columbia University.[9]

Lord's habit of presiding at chapel exercises and teaching regular

classes was not simply the style of a normal school principal. It was consistent with the early role of any American college president.[10] Lord, however, disliked the title "president" for himself. He wrote in 1909 to a friend in Monticello, Illinois: "I agree with you thoroughly that the head of a normal school is a principal."[11] In fact, Lord disliked the use of any titles in his school. In 1917, when a new State Normal Schools Board was considering a uniform set of titles for all schools, Lord wrote the Board:

> We use no such terms here as professor, assistant professor, associate professor, instructor or assistant. The only term used is teacher. You may think it a mere whim, but I dislike exceedingly the use of these terms about a Normal School. The only titles used among us here are "Mr." and "Miss."[12]

Nevertheless, the Board adopted a set of titles as follows: president, dean, professor, assistant professor, instructor, and training teacher. In the following year's budget Lord classified his staff according to this set of titles, but they were not used on campus and did not appear in the school's catalog until many years later. Coleman reports that, "Actually, the teachers at Eastern did not even know what their academic ranks were."[13]

The faculty at Eastern were not well paid. In 1920 they collectively sent a letter to the Board requesting "immediate and substantial salary increases." They pointed out that it was "an anomolous situation when a graduate of a two-year course in a normal school can go out and receive for his first year of teaching a larger salary than many of the teachers who trained him are receiving."[14] Needless to say, this situation did not improve much over time and the same complaint can be heard from some Eastern faculty today.

When Eastern opened in 1899, only forty-six of its 240 students were qualified for admission to college. Many were country school teachers of some years experience, but often — as was true of a fifth of the common school teachers in Illinois at the time — they had no schooling beyond the eighth grade.[15] For these, a four-year course was offered at Eastern. For high school graduates, a two-year course was available. And for the rare college graduate, there was a one-year course.[16] Enrollment rose gradually but steadily over the years, faltering only during and after the First World War and in 1929. When Lord's term ended with his death in 1933, enrollment stood at 964. The staff had increased proportionately from eighteen to seventy.[17]

The mission of the institution also underwent some changes during the Lord years. In 1907, Illinois State Normal, Northern, Southern, and Eastern were granted the power to confer degrees. Lord had not sought this authorization and worried "that if power to confer degrees is given to normal schools various colleges in the state will be antagonized."[18] Subsequently, he opposed any effort to put this authority into effect at Eastern because of two considerations. First, no extra funds would be available. Second, he felt a four year curriculum would be geared to the

preparation of high school teachers, and Lord wanted to continue to concentrate on elementary preparation.[19]

Normal and Southern did grant degrees, however, and the suggestion arose that all the Normal Schools should be redesignated as Teachers Colleges. Lord opposed this suggestion. Writing to President Parkinson of Southern who had raised the issue, he stated: "There might be some gain to us in change of name, but after all, I think the name as it stands perhaps best describes our institutions."[20]

The name was finally changed in 1921, however, and Eastern became Eastern Illinois State Teachers College. By this time Eastern's courses and department structure resembled those of a liberal arts college more than those of many normal schools of the period. For some years it had been regarded informally as a regional college. Many students graduated from its teacher education curricula without the intention to teach. Instead, they entered professional schools or business and industry.[21] Eastern received accreditation as a college in 1928 from the North Central Association.

The governing board structure of the institution also changed during Lord's time in office. When he began in 1898, the school had its own five-member board. In 1917, a single State Normal School Board took over the operation of all five state normal schools (Illinois Normal, Northern, Southern, Eastern, and Western). The Director of the State Department of Registration and Education was the ex-officio chair of this board and the State Superintendent of Public Instruction was the ex-officio secretary. The board consisted of the chair and nine members appointed by the Governor. Although Lord had previously not favored the move to a single board,[22] within two years of its creation he was calling it "a positive gain, unifying the interests and activities of the schools without taking any freedom from any school nor hampering the development of whatever is good and peculiar to any school."[23] The General Assembly seemed to like the new arrangement also. A Senate Committee in 1935 reported:

> That the single State Normal Board which supervises all these teachers colleges, represents a great improvement over the not too distant days when every normal school sought directly from the Assembly the maximum appropriation in order to achieve some minimum greater than its competitors. Largely through the functioning of the board, the Assembly is now saved these multifarious direct approaches, and the presidents of the several schools are spared the necessity of competing with those engaged in cooperative work with them.[24]

Lord developed a strong friendship with Henry Neal, the resident trustee of Eastern's original board. Their families were often in each others' homes.[25] Lord had no use for politics, however. Interviews with legislative committees and appeals to them for needed funds were his most distasteful duties. He persisted in making out the school budget for exactly the sum needed, although he knew it would be cut. He used to

say: "These matters are all settled at two o'clock in the morning, by three or four men in a hotel bedroom."[26] Only three buildings were constructed during Lord's years. With his aversion to lobbying, he might be considered fortunate to have gotten even those few. Coleman has observed: "The necessary compromises of the legislative process had no place in his approach to his responsibilities as the head of a state institution."[27]

Coleman's overall evaluation of Lord seems accurate:

> Mr. Lord was a "benevolent despot" as the leader of the faculty. He took a very broad view of his own responsibilities as president of the school. He brought from Connecticut to Minnesota, and then to Illinois, the attitude of a New England schoolmaster. He was respected by all, loved by many, especially those who came to know him well, feared by many; by some, perhaps, both loved and feared. He did not hesitate to admonish his teachers (as well as the students) on personal matters. The subjects on which his views were fixed, and freely and forcefully expressed, covered a wide range. . . . Although his title was president of a teachers college, he was at heart the principal of a normal school to the day of his death.[28]

Lord died in office in 1933, during the eighty-second year of his life. The inscription on his tombstone in the Charleston, Illinois, cemetery accurately sums up his essential role:

Livingston Chester Lord
1851 - 1933
He Was a Teacher

Robert G. Buzzard

Robert G. Buzzard was appointed as Eastern's second president and took office on October 1, 1933. He had been head of the Geology department at Illinois State Normal University. Previous to that he had been a superintendent of schools and a high school principal. He accepted the presidency on the condition that the Board would "stand behind" him for five years. If it appeared to the Board after five years that he was not the man for the job, then he would leave.[29]

One of the first problems facing Buzzard shortly after he became president was a condition placed on the continued accreditation of Eastern by the North Central Association because of inadequate faculty preparation. Buzzard would later point out that, when he came to Eastern, "fifteen percent of the faculty did not even have bachelor's degrees."[30] In the normal school period, Lord had given little weight to formal training in his selection of teachers. After Eastern became a college Lord gave this factor more weight, but many remained on the faculty who had joined during the normal period.

Buzzard handled the accrediting condition by recruiting more highly-

degreed personnel and by giving leaves to previously-appointed faculty in order that they might have time to pursue their doctorates.[31] By 1947, the faculty of 132 included 61 doctors, 61 masters, and only ten people with less than a master's degree. Four of these ten were substitutes. This brought Eastern into the "upper one percent" of teacher training institutions in the matter of faculty preparation.[32] By 1953, the North Central Association was able to report that "Eastern Illinois State College has the best qualified faculty (both from the viewpoint of advanced degrees and of experience) that the examiners have evaluated in a North Central Association institution of higher education."[33]

Buzzard also had to deal with administrative reorganization when he became president. Lord had practically run the college himself for thirty-four years. During the first year of his presidency, Buzzard appointed a full-time Business manager (the Business manager from 1921 until this time had also doubled as the President's Secretary), a Dean of Men, a Dean of Women, a full-time Dean of the College, a Director of Teacher Training and Placement, a Principal of the Elementary School, a new Principal of the High School, and a Director of Rural Education and Off-Campus Student Teaching. Three years later he also named a Director of Extension, a Director of Public Relations, and a School Physician. After the Second World War, he further increased the size of the administrative staff by adding a Director of Veterans' Services, a Director of Rural Education (a new position, separate from Student Teaching), a Director of Guidance, a Director of Summer School, and a Health Coordinator.

Buzzard also made some drastic changes in chapel exercises. In 1934, at the start of his first full school year as president, he changed the exercises from a daily to a bi-weekly basis. The next year he replaced the exercises with a weekly "college assembly." Twelve years later, in 1947, this weekly assembly was placed in the charge of a student committee, with the president using it only to make a report once a quarter.[34]

Thus the chapel exercises, which had been "Mr. Lord's daily class,"[35] were virtually abandoned by Buzzard as he turned to the concerns of a building program and other administrative affairs. Moreover, whereas Lord had always taught classes, Buzzard never instructed a class at Eastern, nor did he ever undertake a program of systematic teacher supervision as had Lord. Buzzard did, however, continue to interview candidates for the faculty personally before they were hired.[36]

Buzzard gave the faculty more of a voice in advising on policy matters than had Lord. A move in this direction was undertaken in 1951, but only after the Board had made a recommendation that all normal schools establish faculty governance groups, and only after Eastern faculty had specifically requested the establishment of such a group.[37] This first advisory group at Eastern was called the Committee of Fifteen. It was the predecessor of the present Faculty Senate.

The institutional mission also underwent a change under Buzzard. In 1943 the Board authorized a two year general college curriculum, and the degree conferred by the College was changed from a B.Ed. to a B.S. in Ed. In 1947 the name of the institution was changed to Eastern Illinois State College. In 1952 the first M.S. in Ed. was awarded and in 1955 degree requirements were outlined for straight B.A. and B.S. degrees.

The College's governing board changed its name during Buzzard's time in office. In 1949, on the occasion of the allocation of a separate board for Southern, the State Normal School Board was renamed the State Teachers College Board. It was staffed by an executive officer, a financial officer, and three secretaries.[38]

The student enrollment increased during the twenty-three years of the Buzzard era from 963 to 2181. The faculty also grew proportionately from 70 to 180. During this time four new buildings were constructed.

The students at the end of the Buzzard era were of a somewhat different breed. Many of them were veterans, going to college on the G.I. Bill. Buzzard's Dean of Men tells the story of the President taking him out to show him large numbers of these veterans who were breaking the rules by smoking on campus. Buzzard asked the Dean what could be done about it. The Dean replied, "I don't think anything can be done about it."[39] Buzzard has been described, like Lord, as a "benevolent despot,"[40] but by the end of his era the environment which would support his style of leadership was just about gone.

When Buzzard died, some twenty years after his retirement as president, he was buried just two graves away from Lord in the Charleston cemetery. His tombstone inscription, like that of his predecessor, gives an insight into his role, but that role was no longer understood as one consisting primarily of teaching. The inscription reads:

Robert Guy Buzzard
1890 - 1979
President,
Eastern Illinois University

Quincy V. Doudna

Quincy V. Doudna became Eastern's third president in 1956. He had begun his career in education as a high school physics and chemistry teacher, but he "had an eye on administration." He became a high school principal, then head of a small Wisconsin normal school, and finally Dean of Administration at Stevens Point State Teachers College before coming to Eastern as president.[41]

Like Buzzard, Doudna continued the practice of personally interviewing faculty candidates. This was a time-consuming task since the faculty was increasing and there were sometimes fifty to sixty appointments a

year with three candidates to be interviewed for each appointment.

Also like Buzzard, Doudna did not teach while at Eastern. He noted that he had been appointed as "President and Professor of Education," but he said that he only wanted to be president and not a professor, since he was not interested in teaching. He attended meetings of the faculty once a quarter, but he had the Dean of the College preside. He limited himself to announcing his view and explaining his reasonings.[42]

On the day Doudna was introduced on campus as the new president, it was stated that it would be his destiny to preside over the transformation of the institution from a small school to a large one.[43] This was, indeed, to be the case. During the Doudna years of 1956-1971, enrollment rose from 2181 students to 8790 and faculty size increased from 180 to 644. During this period of expansion, Doudna oversaw the completion of thirty-five construction sites on campus. Understandably, Doudna was known in later years as "the builder."

In 1957, Eastern officially became Eastern Illinois University. In 1961, the Illinois Board of Higher Education was organized to coordinate all higher education activities in the state. Four years later the name of Eastern's governing board was changed once again. This time it became the Board of Governors of State Colleges and Universities. With two boards above him, each with executive staffs, Doudna felt some constriction in his autonomy by the end of his term.[44]

It has been noted that student characteristics changed somewhat under Buzzard. They changed even more under Doudna, who was president during the Sixties. It hardly needs to be recalled that these were times of student activism on campus. Issues which students developed at Eastern during this time, and which they eventually won, were: representation on faculty committees, on search committees, and on the Board of Governors; a student judicial system; the elimination of women's "hours;" residence hall visitation; student evaluation of teachers; and a pass-fail system.[45]

In a recent interview, Doudna summed up what he felt were his major accomplishments at Eastern. He pointed to his establishment of a set of general education requirements, to his administrative reorganization involving the establishment of schools and councils in the university, and to his policies enabling the expansion of the summer school program.[46] After the interview he gave this writer a copy of a manuscript which he had prepared two years after his retirement from Eastern. The manuscript is entitled: "Decision Making in an Institution of Higher Education." Its last paragraph is instructive for gaining insight into his view of the president's role:

> The chief executive must be an "idea" man. He must be thinking constantly of ways to improve the institution he heads, of ways to make it render greater service. In addition he must use great skill in promoting the ideas he generates, the improvements he conceives. An administrator who

> is not an idea man and not a promoter is only a skilled operator of administrative machinery — which is not enough, even in a mature institution. But one of the reasons for setting up the proper administrative machinery and for exercising skill in decision making is to give the executive time to generate ideas and to promote them, not only when the institution is young and small, but as it becomes older, larger and more complex. Whether he founded the institution or inherited it when well established the chief executive must organize well and manage well — with the aid of strong and skillful associates — if he is to leave a lasting impact on the institution he heads.[47]

Gilbert C. Fite

The campus search committee which set out to find a replacement for Doudna decided that it was time for Eastern to have a scholar as president.[48] They recommended several appropriate candidates to the Board and the Board appointed one of them — Gilbert C. Fite, a professor of agricultural history who had a notable record of research and publication but who had no significant line administrative experience. At his first press conference, Fite commented that he did not look upon himself as an administrator but as an "educator-scholar" and that he would "provide leadership in that capacity."[49] In a recent interview, Fite said that he came to Eastern "to see if I could make a real university out of an old teachers college." He said that "Eastern was a university in name, but a long way from it in fact." He had hoped to be "an academic research role model" for the faculty, but in fact was "a threat to the faculty rather than a model." He "stressed research in a couple of meetings with the faculty," but he did not feel that it had much effect. He had wanted to be primarily a "scholar-leader," but the budget crunch of 1971, alumni fund raising, and the development of the Tarble Arts Center turned his attention in another direction. He had wanted to be seen as "another faculty member," but he felt that the presidential role wouldn't let him be seen in that way. He came to feel that "there was an inevitable adversarial relationship with the faculty."[50]

The faculty had a long history of unhappiness with their low level of financial compensation. There was also unhappiness with the low level of faculty rights, especially in the governance area. These conditions led to a vote for collective bargaining at the end of Fite's presidency.[51]

Fite was impressed with the "intellectual caliber" of the Board when he came. However, he felt that Governor Daniel Walker "politicized the Board through his appointments." Fite felt "the quality of the Board deteriorated" and this "depressed" him. He "tried to educate the Board to [understand] what a university should be."[52]

Fite felt the Board spent "way too much money in the central office." He felt that most of the central office work was "make-work, and does not mean anything." By this he meant that the central office was "a self-perpetuating small bureaucracy" whose work "didn't affect teaching or research or service — nothing that had any impact on the students'

education."[53]

Fite came to feel that he did not have much personal discretionary power because of the influence of the B.O.G., the I.B.H.E., and their staffs. He was being pressured by the faculty and was faced with unionization.[54] After six years in office, he decided to resign and to take a chair in history at the University of Georgia. During his time in office student enrollment increased from 8790 to 9252. Faculty size decreased from 641 to 612.

Fite's conception of his role might be summed up with the following quote, taken from a recent interview with him:

> There is a crucial relationship between the administration and the faculty. No university can be greater than its faculty. The president has to lead them, to make it possible for them to do their job. Without real researchers, you aren't going to have a real university. There was a strong egalitarian spirit on [Eastern's] campus — [the faculty] thought that people with the same experience ought to be getting the same salary. As opposed to this, my position would be called "elitist." I once told the University Personnel Committee that I would like to see a situation where they could bring in a professor who would be paid more than the president was making.[55]

Daniel E. Marvin, Jr.

After its experience with a "scholar-president," the Board decided to return to someone with more administrative background. It appointed Daniel E. Marvin, Jr., who was then the executive director of the higher education system for the State of Virginia.

In the Fall of 1981, after four years at Eastern, Marvin became the first president since Livingston C. Lord to actually teach a regular class. In August, the Zoology department did not have an instructor to cover a section of a human physiology course. This was the area of Marvin's academic specialty, so the department chairperson asked him to take the section. Marvin agreed. Although the student newspaper spoke of the move as "taking the step down from administrator to instructor,"[56] Marvin himself said: "I certainly don't hold to the idea that moving out of the president's office into teaching is stepping down at all. I really believe it is a different kind of job. Both are critically important."[57] Marvin said that the class had increased his workload substantially, but, "I think it's worth it." He cited advantages of the experience as involving a deepened appreciation for the situation of both students and teachers.[58]

In March of 1983, after six years as Eastern's president, Marvin announced his resignation in order to accept a position as president and chief executive officer of the First National Bank of Mattoon, Illinois, and its holding company, First Mid-Illinois Bancshares, Inc. Marvin had been serving on the bank's board of directors and when the position of president became vacant, the board asked him to accept it. Marvin's

featured comment in the local newspaper story on his resignation was: "I think the institution [Eastern] is better managed than it was when I came here." He cited the instituting of the offices of Personnel and of University Planning and the refinancing of residence hall bonds as accomplishments during his administration. "In addition," he cited restructuring the general education requirements and establishing the senior seminar program and the honors program as his major academic accomplishments. "However," the story concluded, "Marvin said Eastern's budget and getting funding for the university have been his biggest 'frustrations' at Eastern."[59]

During Marvin's six years in office, the enrollment increased from 9384 to 9926. The size of the staff grew from 641 to 660.

In summary, although Marvin returned to the classroom for one semester to cover a teaching vacancy, he clearly thought of his role as president in terms of management rather than instructional leadership. Whatever he decides to put on his tombstone, it will probably not be: "He Was a Teacher."

Conclusion

It is interesting to note the declining length of presidential terms at Eastern: Lord — 34 years, Buzzard — 23 years, Doudna — 16 years, Fite — 6 years, and Marvin — 6 years. Over the course of these terms, the presidential role has undergone a substantial change due to a shift in a number of variables.

The first variable is institutional mission. Eastern began as a normal school where it was expected that the principal would teach, and eventually became a multi-purpose university where it was unusual for the president to teach.

The second variable is enrollment. Eastern started with 240 students and increased to about 10,000. This increase necessitated more administrative specialization and consequently the need for more presidential administrative supervision.

The third variable is governance. Eastern began with its own board, with which the president had an immediate and direct relationship. The governance structure eventually became a multi-tiered set of relationships, with the president serving as a corporate subsidiary executive.

The fourth variable is the faculty. The original faculty was small in size and made up largely of un-degreed practitioners who looked to the president as their principal teacher. The current faculty is much larger in size, composed mostly of terminally-degreed members, and organized into a bargaining unit which views the president in adversarial terms as a representative of management.

The fifth variable is the president's own perspective. Influenced by a number of other variables, this variable involves the president's own perception of what his role should be. This perception has shifted from "teacher" to "manager."

There are other variables which have had a seemingly lesser influence on the presidential role-change over the years. For example, student governance has changed from a condition of practical non-existence to one of structured representation. Governmental relations have changed from a relatively unrestrictive situation to one of documented accountability. Accrediting agencies have changed from being few in number with an attitude of general review, to more specialized groups with more specific standards of compliance. Public relations have changed from concern with only athletics and alumni to more specific service and development concerns involving business, industry, and the local, state, and national communities.

Granted that no one higher educational institution is the same as another, they are enough alike that this case study may serve to show how the shift in the presidential role has come about over the past century.

Notes

[1] Earl James McGrath, "The Evolution of Administrative Offices in Institutions of Higher Education in the United States from 1860 to 1933" (Ph.D. dissertation, The University of Chicago, 1936), p. 195.

[2] *Session Laws*, 39th General Assembly of the State of Illinois (1895), p. 63.

[3] *Passim*, Lord papers, University Archives, Booth Library, Eastern Illinois University, Charleston.

[4] Charles Coleman, "Eastern Illinois State College: Fifty Years of Public Service," *Eastern Illinois State College Bulletin*, No. 189 (January 1, 1950), p. 58.

[5] Quoted in Isabel McKinney, *Mr. Lord: The Life and Words of Livingston C. Lord* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1937), p. 184.

[6] Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

[7] Lord to President David Felmley of Normal, 1905, quoted in Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

[8] McKinney, *op. cit.*, p. 187.

[9] *Ibid.*, p. 355.

[10] Robert Leestamper, "American College Presidency," *Educational Forum*, Vol. 28 (May, 1964), pp. 423-439.

[11] Lord to L.C. Burgess, February 15, 1909, Lord papers.

[12] Lord to F.W. Shepardson, November 24, 1917, Lord papers.

[13] Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 108.

[14] "To the Members of the Normal School Board," unsigned typescript, June 18, 1920, Lord papers.

[15] McKinney, *op. cit.*, p. 176.

[16] Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 59.

[17] These and subsequent statistics on students and faculty were obtained from Norma Winkleblack, Executive Assistant to the President of Eastern Illinois University.

[18] Lord to Senator S.C. Pemberton, March 14, 1907, Lord papers.

[19] McKinney, *op. cit.*, p. 275.

[20] Lord to D.B. Parkinson, November 5, 1909, Lord papers.

[21] Donald F. Tingley, ed., *The Emerging University: Eastern Illinois University, 1949-1974* (Charleston: Eastern Illinois University, 1974), pp. 135-136.

[22] On January 10, 1912, Lord wrote to President C.W. Stone of Farmville, Virginia, favoring a board for each individual school, Lord papers.

[23] *Illinois Blue Book*, 1919-1920, p. 371.

[24] Senator T.V. Smith and Senator W.E.C. Clifford, "Senate Committee Report on Normal Colleges, State of Illinois, reprint, Northern Illinois State Teachers College, DeKalb, 1963, p. 9.

[25] McKinney, *op. cit.*, p. 173.

[26] *Ibid.*, p. 236.

[27] Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

[28] *Ibid.*, pp. 58, 218.

[29] Interview with President Robert G. Buzzard, *Eastern News*, October 20, 1977, p. 6.

[30] *Ibid.*

[31] Tingley, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[32] Coleman, *op. cit.*, p. 297.

[33] Tingley, *op. cit.*, p. 11.

[34] Coleman, *op. cit.*, pp. 142, 343-344.

[35] *Ibid.*, p. 141.

[36] Personal interview with Eastern Associate Professor Bertrand P. Holley, April 19, 1980.

[37] Tingley, *op. cit.*, p. 15.

[38] *Ibid.*, pp. 39-40.

[39] Personal interview with former Eastern Dean of Men Rudolph Anfinson, February 23, 1980.

[40] Personal interview with Eastern Vice President for Student Affairs Glenn Williams, March 3, 1980.

[41] Personal interview with President Quincy V. Doudna, August 25, 1980.

[42] *Ibid.*

[43] Tingley, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

[44] Personal interview with Norma Winkleblack, Executive Assistant to the President of Eastern, March 13, 1980.

[45] Tingley, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

[46] Personal interview with Doudna, August 25, 1980.

[47] "Decision Making in an Institution of Higher Education," unpublished manuscript by Quincy V. Doudna, July 6, 1973.

[48] Tingley, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

[49] *Ibid.*, p. 171.

[50] Personal interview with President Gilbert C. Fite, April 5, 1982.

[51] William Eaton, an educational historian at Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, has pointed out in a personal interview on November 21, 1979, that the unionization movement has been strongest in community colleges and teachers colleges, and that it involves questions of power as much as it does those of money.

[52] Personal interview with Fite, April 5, 1982.

[53] *Ibid.*

[54] Personal interview with Winkleblack, March 13, 1980.

[55] Personal interview with Fite, April 5, 1982.

[56] "Marvin's Example Worthy of Copy," editorial in *The Daily Eastern News*, Charleston, Illinois, September 14, 1981.

[57] "EIU Chief Doubles as Instructor," news story in *The Times-Courier*, Charleston, Illinois, September 30, 1981.

[58] *Ibid.*

[59] "Marvin: University 'Better Managed' than Six Years ago," news story in *The Times-Courier*, Charleston, Illinois, March 22, 1983.

Privileged Turf: Black Participation at the University of Cincinnati; 1955-1976: the Langsam and Bennis Years

Lewis L. Jones
University of Cincinnati

W.E.B. DuBois insisted that the problem of the twentieth century was the problem of the color line.[1] Perhaps no other statement captured the essence of racially segregated Cincinnati during the 1950's and early 1960's. Black citizens held the least desirable jobs, attended racially segregated schools and lived in segregated neighborhoods. Clarence Clemons, a black resident of Cincinnati since 1955, recalled that black people simply did not live in certain sections of the city.[2] The 1960 census tracts showed that black residents were concentrated in four neighborhoods: West End, Walnut Hills, Mount Auburn and Avondale.

Discrimination also characterized the employment sector. Alfred Khun found that job discrimination against blacks was almost absolute in top-level management and administrative positions. He established that job orders routinely specified white only and that finding a job for a black person, whose qualifications were equal to whites, was extremely difficult.[3] (Twenty years ago, the *Cincinnati Enquirer* ran segregated employment classified ads.) Blacks were concentrated in low skill, low-pay and undesirable jobs. This practice closed certain employment opportunities to blacks (primary effect) and kept them from becoming qualified (secondary effect) for technical and skilled positions.[4] Myron Bush, former mayor of Cincinnati, stated that no blacks were in the building trades in 1961 and that public funds subsidized construction projects that did not employ blacks.[5]

During the 1950's and 60's, the Cincinnati Public School system was just as rigidly segregated as employment and housing. Segregation increased in the schools during that time span. Walter Nicholes traced that development to the de facto segregationist policies of the school district.[6] Racial practices in public education coincided with those in employment and housing. Cincinnati was basically a "closed society" for black people. No one was surprised that those practices extended to social activities.

Coney Island, a privately owned amusement park, prohibited blacks from swimming in Sunlite Pool in 1961, despite a five year legal battle that forced it to admit blacks in 1959 to the general area.[7] Blacks found it difficult to gain access to white-operated entertainment and recreational facilities. Charles Nuckols, who moved to Cincinnati during the fifties, stated that his family was not admitted to a theater in Norwood because of racial discrimination.[8] (Norwood is a predominantly white, blue collar city surrounded by the city of Cincinnati.)

Cincinnati, "the Gateway to the South," was indistinguishable from its southern neighbors on the racial issue. It was a conservative city that encouraged segregationists practices during the 1950's and 60's. It was a city in which some of the most prominent people openly battled CORE and the NAACP for twenty years to prevent any substantial changes in the treatment of black citizens. It was a city where black people had to engage in boycotts, selective buying campaigns and court battles to win minimum concessions from business and government. Hugo Green, a University of Cincinnati student during the mid-1950's, chided the city for its treatment of blacks. Green criticized the media for ignoring the problem and supported "boycotts, lawful protest, any lawful means to end discrimination."[9] This was the city that Walter Langsam came to in 1955 to become the seventeenth president of the University of Cincinnati.

The Langsam Era

Walter Langsam came to Cincinnati with considerable presidential experience. He was the former president of Gettysburg College (Pennsylvania) and Wagner College on Staten Island. No stranger to the urban environment, he received a B.A. from the City College of New York, a Ph.D. from Columbia, and he also taught history there before starting his administrative career. Langsam characterized himself as a supporter of football, fraternities and sororities and concluded that they were important to student development.[10] One faculty member recalled that Langsam was extremely business oriented, sympathetic to the military and an admirer of royalty.[11]

Langsam also joined the "right" clubs. He was a member of the Commercial Club — one which consisted of the top twenty businessmen in the community, and each of whom had to have at least one million dollars in business. He joined the Queen City Club, a club that excluded blacks and women.[12] (The University of Cincinnati actually paid for the President's membership fee.) The city hired a conservative man to manage the University in a style consistent with community practices. It was not surprising that Langsam made no statements about race in 1955 or the early years of his administration. He remained silent, despite a major court decision that affected higher education.

The Supreme Court issued a decision subsequently labeled Brown II. The North Carolina federal district court ruled that the 1954 Brown decision applied to colleges as well as public schools.[13] The U.S. Supreme Court upheld that decision in 1955. Brown II formed the legal basis for allowing blacks to attend predominantly white colleges and universities in a more tangible manner.

The 1958 Rosenwald Report provided another opportunity for Langsam to address the racial issue and the black presence at the University. The Rosenwald Report showed that only two hundred (200) blacks were employed in white colleges and that thirty-nine (one-fifth) were in New

York state alone.[14] It suggested that the average white administrator did not seriously consider employing blacks as faculty members, and it also concluded that blacks were excluded routinely from professional and graduate schools.

Given Cincinnati's past, Langsam did not have to turn to Supreme Court decisions or foundation reports; instead, he could have examined his own university for examples that were both illegal and exclusionary. Until the late 60's, the University of Cincinnati did not employ blacks as faculty members. Gene Lewis, who came to Cincinnati in 1958 as an assistant professor of history, recalled that the College of Arts and Sciences, the largest College in the University, did not employ any black faculty from 1958 to 1968.[15] Mary Woeful, Assistant Sr. Vice President for Budgetary Affairs and former administrator in Arts and Sciences, supported Lewis' claim by pointing out that, prior to 1968, the College of Arts and Sciences did not have a single black faculty member or administrator.[16]

Langsam could have examined also some of the restrictions placed upon black students at the University. Until the 1960's, the University routinely segregated black students in housing. Black women could not attend bath rooms in the student union and were prohibited from taking swimming classes with white students. Instead, black women were forced to enroll in segregated classes that were held after hours.[17]

Social life at the University revolved around the Greek system. Although Langsam endorsed Greek-letter organizations, he did not question the exclusionary clauses of white fraternities and sororities that made it impossible for black students to participate. Prior to 1965, the Inter-Fraternity Council permitted WASP clauses that denied membership to black students. Yet, he claimed during his inauguration that Greek activities were germane to student development.

The importance of those issues to Blacks was not perceived by the University during the initial years of the Langsam administration. Although they were basic areas (employment, housing, social life), the University refused to address them in any substantive manner during the first five years of the Langsam presidency. In the late 60's, early signs that the racial question could no longer be ignored began to emerge.

The initial attempt to deal with the racial question was led by students. That early movement was biracial and limited to obvious acts of discrimination. The students were largely unorganized and spoke out against stores in the community that were still segregated. In 1961, a group of white U.C. students picketed Kresge's stores to force complete integration. They also supported the Congress of Racial Equality's (CORE) petition that asked the junior class not to use Moon Lite Gardens for its prom, since it discriminated against blacks.[18]

The University remained aloof from student efforts, despite the fact

that neither black nor white students articulated the basic consequences of racial discrimination at U.C. No group attacked (in the early sixties) the University's hiring policies. Neither black nor white students questioned the University's responsibility to address social problems created by the tensions of urban living. What is even more important is that no group questioned Langsam's silence on policies that limited diversity in all aspects of University life.

Perhaps the editorial board of the campus paper understood the situation better than most in the early sixties. The *News Record* editorialized that prominent people (in Cincinnati) and the media paid lip service to the idea of equality.[19] Commenting on the racial climate at the University, the editors stated that the difference between Southern bigotry and Cincinnati's was a matter of degree — not kind. Turning to student organizations at the University, the editorial raised three crucial questions.

1. How many fraternities and sororities still retained race and religious restrictions?
2. How many blacks were members of ULEX — an athletic honorary?
3. How many blacks were members of ODK, Mortar Board — Academic Societies?

The editorial implied that those questions could be applied to every campus group. Although initial editorial commentary and biracial student protest responded to surface issues, it cannot be denied that they eventually raised the consciousness of other groups and forced them to act.

A human relations group at the University documented the charges made by the *News Record*. It found that ULEX and SIGMA had no black members; that the University approved off-campus housing that was segregated; and that the University itself operated segregated dormitories.[20] For example, black women were permitted to stay in only one residence hall: Memorial. Others such as Probasco and Huber were off-limits. The Inter-Racial Fellowship organization pointed out that the University sanctioned segregated women's rest rooms in the Union and segregated housing. In 1963, the College Conservatory dormitory, Huber Hall and Ludlow Hall were segregated housing facilities.[21]

Public protest, embarrassing questions and documented charges made it impossible for the University to remain silent. The administration responded in the most cautious manner. It appointed panelists to discuss race relations and confirmed the University's commitment to *voluntary* integration. William Nester, Dean of students, claimed that he was unaware of any conflicts that were racially based. Nester argued that demonstrations, protests and petitions were unnecessary in order to resolve complaints. He also argued that no serious problems existed but admitted the existence of some "indiscrepancies (sic) in various segments of the campus."[22]

A combination of moral imperatives and political realities caused the University to reconsider its policies on race. This was a milestone for blacks who looked upon the University as an institution that was indifferent to their interests. The administration realized that conditions had to change. A few administrators understood that the questions raised in Cincinnati were related to issues that had national significance. The mid 60's approached and change became inevitable.

Although Langsam did not employ any blacks on his staff, several white administrators were sympathetic to black concerns. Thomas Bonner, Vice President for Academic Affairs, joined other white faculty members (Daniel Beaver, Gene Lewis, Louis Harlan) on the Montgomery March to demonstrate against George Wallace. Those members of the University created an impression that the University could no longer consider itself a regional entity. Liberal white administrators indicated that the University was ready to readjust its policies and practices with respect to its most excluded group: blacks.

Another critical development in the mid 60's was the change in the character of student activism. By 1967, protest against exclusionary treatment and other University policies became more separatists and black-centered. Black students formulated the questions and challenged administrative policies at the highest levels. Black students pointed out that, after twelve years of the Langsam presidency, the University employed one black police officer, a small number of black clerical workers, one black resident advisor, and no blacks in the McMicken College of Arts and Sciences.[23] Black students made it impossible for the administration to ignore the obvious: a racial problem existed and the University had a poor image in the black community. Clinton Herman, a black writer for the University's student daily, urged the president to take a public stand on the issues raised by black students. Instead, Langsam initiated an act that further discouraged and displeased black students. He appointed a Committee on Racial Relations to address the problem.

Appointing a committee did not satisfy black students who had moved to a more penetrating analysis and had their consciousness raised by national issues. For example, by 1967, the term black started to replace Negro in many campus publications. This development was both politically and culturally significant. The analysis of the black condition at the University became more incisive. Blacks moved from concerns about alienation, subtle faculty discrimination and rejection by a white-controlled Greek system to a more basic issue: the humanization of a place where they were going to spend a large portion of their young adult lives. Blacks gave priority to issues that were in their self-interest and would facilitate their adjustment to an institution that was overwhelmingly white. (Few black students attended the University prior to 1967. The University had no black administrators and only one of two black faculty members.) For the first time at the University, the administration was forced to deal with an organized body of articulate students who monitored and criticized policies that had an adverse impact on blacks.

Perhaps no other body served that role more effectively than the United Black Association.

The emergence of the UBA in the spring of 1967 was another milestone. The general objective was to "alleviate the second-class status of black students at the University of Cincinnati."[24] The UBA also had some specific goals. Prominent among them was the need to: 1) consider campus problems as they affected blacks; 2) unite militant and non-militant students around a common agenda; and 3) recruit more blacks by working with the administration.[25] The organization was influential and some immediate changes occurred. More black activists, popular groups and nationally known speakers (Nathan Hare, Edgar Toppin, Samuel Proctor, LeRoi Jones) appeared on campus. The University indicated a desire to respond seriously to black concerns.

If the University assumed that such activities were sufficient, nothing could have been further from reality. Langsam and the University were caught up in the turbulent sixties and neither was immune to the force of national events. The shift toward black student activism at the University did not occur in a vacuum. Blacks at the University were influenced by acts of civil disobedience that occurred throughout the country. Fogelson and Hill documented that, during 1967 and 1968, riots occurred in the black section of every major city: New York, Los Angeles, Newark, Detroit, Boston, Cleveland and Cincinnati.[26] They concluded that a substantial number of blacks participated in the riots; that rioters were representative of ghetto communities; that large numbers of non-rioters sympathized with blacks who actively participated in the riots and that the riots were a manifestation of race more than poverty.[27]

In 1967 and 1968, Avondale, a black neighborhood adjacent to the University, erupted into racial violence. In 1967, rioting cost the city three million dollars in damages and forced the Cincinnati Public Schools to cancel classes for part of the academic year.[28] Students at the University were allowed to receive their diplomas by mail or attend commencement. In 1968, rioting in Cincinnati proved more costly. Two blacks were killed in Avondale, and blacks stabbed to death a white University of Cincinnati graduate student.[29] It was in this climate that the UBA made its most serious charge against Langsam and presented a list of non-negotiable demands.

The UBA charged that the president "upheld and sanctioned customs, practices which maintained attitudes that perpetuated racial tensions."[30] The University was compelled to deal with more than the paucity of black undergraduate students. UBA demanded that the University appoint blacks to the Board of Directors, hire more black administrators and faculty, increase the number of blacks in non-academic jobs and develop an innovative program for high-risk students.[31] Black students urged the University to reconsider its graduate admissions standards for discriminatory effects and require all undergraduate majors to take courses in black history. They demanded a cultural center, official housing in the

student union and scholarships for black students.

Those demands were consistent with ones made by black students at white colleges across the country. Allen B. Ballard discovered that black demands could be lumped into four categories: 1) black-controlled black studies programs; 2) dormitory or cultural space for black students; 3) admission quotas for black students; and 4) special tutorial and financial aid.[32] Ballard's findings paralleled the demands made by the University's black students.

The administration's response to those demands proved interesting and Langsam's was generally favorable. He realized that 1968 was a pivotal year. The death of Martin Luther King, Jr. and the attendant black response across the country meant that old ways of problem solving at the University were inadequate. He did not oppose admitting more black students, and black undergraduate enrollment increased by twenty (20) percent in 1967-68.[33] Langsam informed the UBA that most of their demands were "in place or would be initiated." The president did not resist the opportunity to lecture the UBA leadership. He suggested that the UBA follow the Cincinnati idea: Neither coercion nor apathy in the matter of student grievances was appropriate.[34] That attitude was indicative of a larger problem that circumscribed the administration's attempts to address black concerns.

Neither Langsam nor his staff adequately grasped the problem. The University did not perceive the centrality of the UBA's demands and the cause of black hostility. The goals of the two groups were different. The UBA wanted to reverse the results of years of exclusion and discrimination. It wanted to cause structural changes at the University — changes that would allow black students to feel like first-class citizens and whole people. The administration was led by a conservative pragmatist who dealt with minority concerns only after a crisis.

The twenty percent increase in black undergraduate enrollment was a reaction to political pressure. The administration neither advocated for the increase nor considered questions associated with effective planning. Namely, how would black students be supported? Could the staff work with students from different economic and cultural backgrounds? How would admission, grading and retention be handled? What could the University do to make the environment less alien to black students? Langsam wanted order; blacks wanted enduring changes. It should not have surprised the administration that black students remained cynical about the University's commitment.

That cynicism eventually exploded into civil disobedience. The administration's cautious behavior was perceived by black students as another attempt to manipulate their concerns. On May 20, 1969, the University experienced its first major student disturbance. The UBA held a morning meeting and emerged with 18 demands. Approximately 150 students marched on the administration building and the leaders of the

UBA issued an ultimatum: Langsam had 24 hours to reply to their demands.[35] The ultimatum was indicative of the gap in communication between the two groups.

The UBA demands were essentially a restatement of earlier ones: more black history courses, meaningful community involvement, UBA office space, increased undergraduate and graduate enrollment, more black faculty and administrators. The demands also contained new components. The UBA specified the number of blacks that it wanted in each academic area.[36] They called for a black Dean of University College (a 2 year college within the University system), a black administrator in the admissions office, no construction that interfered with black housing in the adjacent community. Black students were particularly concerned that the University had not responded to their request for an Afro-American Studies Department. The development of that department ranked high on their list of non-negotiable demands. The UBA also called for a boycott of classes. That demand precipitated the disturbance. Some minor "trashing" of one building occurred, a few classes were disrupted by a small band of students, but, by comparison, the University's first student disturbance was a minor event.

Several interesting responses to the disturbances emerged. (One staff member noted the occasion by writing on his desk calendar: Revolution, 8:00 to 5:00.) Perhaps the most accurate characterization of the administration's response was that it represented a balance between velvet and steel. Walter Langsam clearly was the steel. He adopted a hard-line position by maintaining that attendance at the University was a privilege. Langsam sought and obtained a temporary restraining order that forbade student demonstrations. He approved the issuance of court orders that charged certain members of the UBA with assault and battery. Perhaps most distressing to blacks was his approval of John Doe warrants that allowed officers to arrest students who were suspected of participating in demonstrations. Langsam also set up another advisory committee to consider the long-range UBA goals and promised to intensify efforts to employ qualified blacks in academic and non-academic positions.[37]

If Langsam represented steely determination, his Vice President for Academic Affairs, Thomas Bonner, was the velvet. Having marched in civil rights demonstrations, he was sympathetic to the concept of equality of opportunity and the need for an urban university to adjust to a changing social order. Bonner opposed the UBA tactics but admitted that the students' demands were legitimate. He also explained that the University had met most of them, including requests for courses in black history and literature, space, financial aid, community involvement. Bonner defended the University's efforts to increase the number of black faculty. He pointed out that the University employed thirty full-time black faculty in 1969, three times the number in 1967.[38] (Bonner compared the University of Cincinnati to other universities. He noted that Berkeley had five black faculty; that Harvard had one; and that Chicago had three.) More importantly, he announced that the University had authorized the

search for a person to develop the black studies program, despite receiving the proposal in December, 1968.[39] Although Bonner was sensitive to black concerns, not everyone was impressed with the administration's response.

The black faculty, for the first time in the struggle to gain greater black access to the University, became more vocal. Led by Ronald Temple, president of the United Black Faculty Association, they chided President Langsam for imposing a double standard. Temple demanded that the administration lift the injunction, since white students who participated in the disturbance were not treated similarly. (Several SDS members had joined the black-initiated demonstration.) The UBFA accused Langsam of "playing up to conservative, right wing Cincinnati"[40] and alienating the entire black community. Temple admonished Langsam for not making a reasonable effort to diversify the University. He reminded Langsam that, in his fourteen years as president, not one black had served in central administration. Most black administrators held junior administrative positions in student affairs. The UBFA remained unimpressed with the University's attempt to upgrade black faculty.

Temple held that special consideration was the only way for blacks to gain equality. Such action by the University would show a good faith effort to make up for past discrimination against blacks. The UBFA wanted the administration to consult blacks about all decisions on hiring, dismissal, promotion and community involvement.[41] Temple argued that the University should have applauded black students for sensitizing the academic community to their needs. It was against this background that the University granted, in the eyes of many, its most important concession.

In April, 1970, the Arts and Sciences faculty endorsed the establishment of an Afro-American Studies program. Support for the black studies program was widespread. Black faculty, black students and the black community endorsed the idea overwhelmingly. The administration gave its support, and the black community welcomed the program. The University's daily editorialized that it was "the first opportunity for white members of the University to take an even more active role in the black community surrounding the University.[42] The editorial argued that the program should combine professional practice with academic study. The editors believed that faculty and students should conduct research projects germane to the black community.

Despite support from several quarters, the Afro-American studies program had its problems. The most obvious problem with the development of the University's Afro-American Studies program was the passive role played by black faculty and administrators. No real analysis or conceptional thinking emerged from either group. Black faculty allowed negotiations to take place largely between black students and white administrators. Black faculty did not conceptualize a plan that identified the needs of inner city residents or seriously consider the manner in which

the lives of urban Cincinnatians could be improved by the development of an Afro-American Studies program. No black faculty or administrator effectively countered the criticism by some that black studies programs lacked academic integrity.

The development of the Afro-American Studies program was a classic example of black faculty allowing the administration to isolate black issues. No black faculty or administrator simultaneously developed a plan for allowing black students to enter math, science, engineering, medical school, law and technical fields — areas with historically low black enrollment at the University.

Another major problem that hampered the development of the Afro-American Studies department was timing. It emerged during an era when the University experimented with more liberalized degree requirements and responded to political pressure. Instead of allowing ample lead time, the University rushed through a program that was inadequately staffed, under-financed, and mocked by faculty members in other disciplines. The University did not conduct an extensive search for an able scholar to develop the curriculum. The first Director had no training at the doctoral level that could be considered important to Afro-American Studies. The University approved the Afro-American Studies program out of a sense of urgency. It was not designed for any population other than the one identified with the program. Neither the administration nor the faculty assumed that white students would seriously consider studying Afro-American history and culture. Kenneth Clark may well have had institutions like U.C. in mind when he wrote:

> If a University administration can restore harmony and the image of innovation by a no-strings attached financial grant to a separate black studies program that may cover a few salaries . . . , it need not move to transform itself into a genuinely non-racial institution dedicated to developing human beings and to helping them develop effective strategies for fundamental change.[43]

Black students seemed to have assessed the situation more critically than black faculty. It was they who demanded that the University hire five blacks in sociology; 4 in philosophy, 2 in psychology, 3 in math; 6 in history; 3 in DAAP, 7 in CCM; 8 in English and 9 in education.[44] Black faculty and administrators presented no comparable plan for students and allowed the University to concentrate black undergraduate enrollment in one area: University College. Enrollment data for 1969-1970 showed that most black students (336) were enrolled in University College — a two-year college; the total black enrollment was 907.[45]

Gene Lewis thought that University College became a repository — not by design for black students. The McMicken College of Arts and Sciences, Lewis held, would not accept them under the assumption that standards would be lowered.[46] Arts and Sciences did not believe in remedial work, despite its location in a city with a large inner city population. A major consequence was the development of little ghettos

within the University. The University fulfilled its obligation to blacks by creating black enclaves: University College, Afro-American Studies. Other parts of the University remained unchanged essentially. It was not surprising that blacks, in the year (1971) of Walter Langsam's retirement, began to question their achievements.

It cannot be denied that blacks made significant strides in the latter part of the Langsam administration. Blacks could point to some visible changes in the University's policies and practices. Campus housing was no longer rigidly segregated. The president endorsed a policy of non-discrimination in housing and appointed a black as Director of off-campus housing. Black undergraduate enrollment increased by twenty percent in 1969; 20 percent of all financial aid went to black students. By 1970, black undergraduate enrollment was five percent of the total University undergraduate enrollment (17,080).[47]

Prior to 1968, no blacks were appointed to staff and line positions; by 1969, fifteen were appointed, including a black Assistant Director of Community Relations, Assistant Dean of Men and Assistant Registrar.[48] In 1971, the year of Langsam's retirement, the number of black faculty went from a "hand-full" to forty-six; only ten were tenured. Changes in the curriculum were noticeable also. Courses in black history, black literature, African history, race relations and urban history were scattered throughout the University. The most prominent gain, despite the inherent problems, was the establishment of an Afro-American Studies program.

Most blacks still remained skeptical about the quality of their achievements. Ronald Temple, history instructor and former UBFA president, stated that the Langsam administration made no major attempts to put black faculty in several high administrative posts: Associate Vice President, Provost, Associate Provost, Vice Provost, Deans, Assistant Deans.[49] Black faculty and students realized that they had not penetrated the inner sanctum of decision-making. Yet, they were cautiously optimistic that hard won gains would be expanded with the next president.

The Bennis Era

Blacks had ample reasons to be optimistic about Langsam's successor and to expect support for their issues. The eighteenth president of the University of Cincinnati was Warren Bennis, a forty-six year old former Vice President of Academic Affairs at the State University of New York at Buffalo. Most Cincinnatians, including blacks, welcomed him with great enthusiasm. He was considered a "mover" in academic administration and earned his B.A. from that citadel of progressive thought in higher education: Antioch College. A MIT Ph.D. and the author of fourteen books in administration and management, Bennis assumed the Presidency on September 1, 1971.

Several early decisions further impressed black faculty, administrators

and students. He rescinded the Langsam policy of limiting student demonstrations to one section of the campus.[50] (Bennis resigned the Acting Executive Vice Presidency at SUNY-Buffalo to "protest undo use of force in dealing with campus disorders.") He refused to join the Queen City Club — a club that previously excluded blacks. And, he said the right things. When questioned about the role of an urban University, he stated that "universities should be in the forefront of everything that affects society."[51] Clearly, Bennis was perceived as an administrator with a social conscience. Many labeled him a social reformer — a new president who believed that the University should be used as a mechanism for solving social problems. One of his earliest statements to the academic community was that the University of Cincinnati must be innovative, a center of learning and toleration and truly an urban institution.[52]

Blacks were particularly sanguine after he expressed his views on affirmative action and minority affairs. Bennis stated that one of his immediate goals was to develop and monitor an affirmative action program. He criticized the practice of "bringing in the black assistant." Instead, he held that qualified blacks should be hired for responsible positions at every level of the University. His goal, Bennis explained, was to recruit aggressively for qualified blacks. He argued against special positions like the Vice President for Minority Affairs and chided the previous administration for making expedient decisions "out of guilt and fear."[53] He called that action "a crisis in management" that led to ad-hoc programs that were under-financed and inadequately supported. Bennis considered that style to be "typical of the way white liberals dealt with black concerns" and admitted that the University of Cincinnati was "way behind in hiring minorities — even behind the construction unions."[54]

Several persons who were familiar with Bennis traced the increased black presence on campus to his policies and support for affirmative action. Vera Edwards, a black associate professor emeritus, thought that Warren Bennis' administration marked the real turnaround for blacks.[55] Gene lewis, Provost and Senior Vice President during the Bennis years, recalled that Bennis brought in more black administrators. An examination of the major components of the University during the Bennis years proved to be more informative. Although black students were less optimistic than most, it also revealed that the majority of blacks were prematurely optimistic about the new president's ability to change things.

While their numbers increased, the United Black Association held that the quality of life for most blacks on the campus was still poor. Soon after Bennis' inauguration, a report showed that black students were discriminated against in representation on University committees.[56] The UBA called Bennis' policies ineffective in curriculum reform, financial aid to minority students and affirmative action. It specifically identified the College Conservatory of Music as one College that still practiced racism

with respect to black faculty and student recruitment. The UBA called University College a farce and claimed that black students were deliberately tracked there.

An examination of the data revealed that most black students on the central campus were enrolled in University College. In 1970, undergraduate black enrollment on the central campus was five (5) percent of the total student body.[57] Thirty-seven percent of all black students were enrolled in University College.[58] The remainder was sparsely distributed in the other eight colleges. Six years later, the year of Bennis' resignation, total black undergraduate enrollment increased to twelve (12) percent[59]; thirty-five (35) percent of all black undergraduates were still enrolled in University College.[60] It appeared that University College had indeed become a repository for black students.

The University's urban affairs representative charged that white faculty discriminated against blacks in the classroom and urged Bennis to set up a watch dog committee.[61] Black law students made similar charges. In a 1973 letter to Bennis, they charged the Law College with discrimination in grade assignment and traced the high attrition among blacks in the College to discrimination. They also noted that only 20 blacks had graduated from the nation's third oldest law school in 1973.[62]

Black faculty also became increasingly dismayed with decreases in their numbers and Bennis' inactivity on affirmative action. They approved his endorsement of an Anti-Discrimination Tribunal "to hear and adjudicate on cases that violated the University's anti-discrimination policy," but black faculty pointed to some alarming developments. For example, the University employed forty-six full-time black faculty members on the central campus at the start of his administration; that number decreased to forty by 1974.[63] They charged Bennis with treating affirmative action rhetorically. The evidence suggested that blacks had adequate grounds for making that claim.

The AAUP charged that the University violated federal law (revised order number 4) by not meeting the requirement for an affirmative action program. That charge was made February 13, 1973. Two years later, the Department of Health, Education and Welfare cited the University for its failure to correct inequities in salaries paid to women and blacks.[64] HEW noted that the University deliberately discriminated against employees because of their sex and race with respect to pay. It also supported the AAUP's observation that the University's affirmative action program did not comply with equal opportunity laws. The report showed that black and women employees were discriminated against within a wide spectrum of job classifications.

That evidence increased the credibility gap between blacks and the Bennis administration. Blacks observed that the President's rhetoric was often at variance with University action. Black faculty realized that Bennis could not be blamed for all the problems. For example, they understood that chairpersons and Deans also played a central role in the

hiring of black faculty. Given Bennis' strong public support for qualified minorities at all levels of the University, blacks did expect him to act more affirmatively on decisions that did not require faculty approval.

Perhaps the best indication of Bennis' attitude toward affirmative action was his administrative appointments. He blasted the previous administration for making expedient black appointments. In a speech before black community leaders, Bennis exclaimed:

> A necessary condition of success in the 70's for the University is the development and implementation of an affective affirmative action program involving women and minorities. If we fail to include groups of those who have been systematically denied access to higher education in past decades, we will not only waste valuable human resources, but we will be unable to depend upon the high esteem of our surrounding community.[65]

Bennis' initial response to black demands was to promote a black from Coordinator of Community Affairs to Vice President for Community Relations. This was a created position, in which the occupant was to serve in an advisory capacity on a wide range of matters involving urban affairs and general University problems. The specific responsibilities were nebulous and lay beyond the daily activity of central administration.

Bennis' other major black appointment followed a similar pattern. Charles Johnson came to the University with impressive credentials. He was a linquist, holder of a Ph.D. from the University of Vienna, and former professor in the Harvard School of Business. Bennis appointed him to the position of Vice President for Metropolitan Affairs.[66] This too was a recently established position to link urban expertise at the University to the metropolitan community.

A pattern developed that revealed some inconsistency between Bennis' rhetoric and his action. Blacks appointed by him were in student services, metropolitan affairs or human resource administration.[67] Bennis did not appoint blacks to crucial decision making and policy-setting positions. Instead, his black appointments tended to operate on the edge of University administration in created positions. By 1974, there were fifty-six whites and five blacks in central administration. Lawrence Hawkins, the only black academic administrator, was a holdover from the Langsam years.

Thomas Wagner, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs and former assistant to Bennis, believed that Bennis isolated his black appointees. Wagner referred to several compelling facts. Black administrators who were appointed by Bennis were not in the traditional roles at the University. They were in created positions, exercised no influence with Bennis or the University's power structure, and were not a part of the mainstream of the University.[68] Blacks appointed under those conditions, Wagner maintained, had no real opportunity to succeed. He specifically recalled two examples: Charles Johnson, the University's first black Vice-President and William D. Smith. Wagner thought that Johnson was not given the

opportunity to become a part of the University and that Smith became an assistant to Bennis without responsibility, direction or support.[69] Smith occupied a position that had no structure and made his contributions insignificant.

Wagner also recalled that Bennis appointed primarily local blacks because they were active in the community. No comprehensive, national search was made when blacks were hired. Charles Johnson resigned after two years, "due to inadequate support from Bennis, institutionalized racism, and the University's deplorable attitude toward affirmative action."[70] His successor, Lawrence Hawkins, was moved from his position as Dean of the College of Community Services to the position of Vice President for Metropolitan Affairs and Continuing Education. The title changed but the ambiguity remained intact. Hawkins's role was also poorly defined. Blacks became increasingly concerned about the quality of the positions that they occupied during the Bennis years. Certain jobs appeared to be targeted for them.

Bennis had several opportunities to put his rhetoric into practice. From 1971 to 1974, five Deans were appointed: Medicine, Law, Education, Business, Design, Art and Architecture. The University did not appoint one black person to a Deanship. No black person was considered for the position of Executive Vice President. All of the aforementioned positions were filled by white males. It was not until 1975, four years into the Bennis administration, that a black dean was hired. Ronald Temple, former special assistant to Bennis, was appointed Dean of University College[71] — a two-year College with the largest black enrollment on the central campus.

By 1975, both black students and faculty members were unimpressed with the University's commitment to affirmative action. The general perception among blacks was that an all-white male club existed at the University — a group of white men who ran the institution.[72] After two decades of struggle — years that encompassed the Presidencies of Walter D. Langsam and Warren Bennis — blacks still confronted a compelling question: was there a qualitative improvement in their position at the University of Cincinnati?

Conclusions

During the 1950's, the University was perceived by blacks as an institution for whites. Admissions policies did not act as a barrier to blacks. Instead, social custom discouraged them. Blacks saw U.C. as a place for students from white working-class families. Events during the latter part of the 60's changed that perception.

It was black students, not black faculty, who initially guaranteed that the University could no longer ignore black concerns. They protested strongly when either the Langsam or the Bennis administration attempted to manipulate black issues. The politics of black protest was an effective tactic and was crucial to getting more blacks hired as staff members,

administrators and faculty. The University was not a benevolent institution that decided to give blacks something. It was not an advocate for black issues. Instead, administrators in both the Langsam and Bennis years simply modified policies that were either intolerable due to black vigilance or blatantly illegal. The significant point was not that the University responded, but how it dealt with black demands.

The University's main strategy was to employ blacks in casual administrative positions instead of increasing the number of black faculty. A few blacks were hired in student affairs in the latter years of the Langsam administration. Herbert Shapiro, University of Cincinnati history professor and long-time observer of race relations, held that the University was apprehensive about including blacks in the structure of the University.[73] Tenured black faculty members could be more outspoken and independent. Black administrators served at the pleasure of the administration and were more sensitive to the University's control over them. The record showed that no black administrator emerged as a strong advocate for black issues in either the Langsam or Bennis administration.

A discernible pattern emerged in both administrations. Black administrators were hired to oversee recently created units. The University's first black Dean (the Langsam years) was employed to manage the newly created College of Community Services in 1969.[74] The University's first black Vice President (the Bennis years) was appointed to a created position. He was assigned to administer an umbrella organization that dealt with non-academic programs and urban issues — issues that lay beyond the mainstream of academic administration. The University also created new second and third echelon positions that were staffed by blacks. This strategy was especially obvious during the Bennis years. Black administrators tended to be special assistants, assistants or managers of newly created positions that dealt with community affairs.

The University also attempted to isolate black issues. Langsam and Bennis appointed special committees to study and make recommendations on black concerns. Perhaps the best example of the isolation of black issues was the development of the Afro-American studies program. The aftermath of 1968 produced the Afro-American Studies Department, but it had no tangible impact on other Colleges. Most black faculty were employed in that department, and no real attempt was made to include blacks throughout the University. The University attempted to meet its obligations to blacks by creating black enclaves: black studies programs, open admission college, minority affairs programs, minority counseling programs. After more than two decades of struggle, blacks could point to only modest gains. Those achievements developed because the University could no longer ignore black issues — not because of a ground-swell of enthusiasm for their cause.

Langsam was simply indifferent to black concerns until 1968. He made no statements about the need to diversify the University. There was no presidential initiative on issues that were related to black access to the

University. Gains made by blacks during the latter years of the Langsam administration resulted from the intervention of sensitive, liberal staff members and the need to defuse volatile situations.

Warren Bennis commented repeatedly about the centrality of affirmative action and the need to involve the University in solving social problems. He brought more blacks into administration, but their influence was minimal due to the nature of their appointments. Several black administrators resigned due to role ambiguity and lack of presidential support. The number of black, full-time faculty actually decreased during the Bennis administration. Bennis was a dilettante on affirmative action and an administrative failure with respect to implementing policies that increased the black presence in mainstream administrative posts.

Neither president included blacks in critical decision-making positions. The percentage of blacks among chief line officers was nonexistent in the Langsam years and in insignificant during the Bennis administration. A close inspection showed that blacks functioned on the margin at the University of Cincinnati during both eras. Tangible black participation remained a dream deferred.

Notes

[1] W.E.B. DuBois, *The Souls of Black Folk* (New York: Signet Classics, 1969), p. 154.

[2] Interview with Clarence Clemons, EPA Administrator, Cincinnati, Ohio, May 1, 1983.

[3] Alfred Kuhn, *Report on Racial Discrimination in Employment in the Cincinnati* (Cincinnati: S.H. Wilder Foundation, [1952], p. 55-66.

[4] *Ibid.*

[5] S. Arthur-Spiegel, "Affirmative Action in Cincinnati," *Cincinnati Historical Society Bulletin* (Summer, 1979), p. 78-88.

[6] Walter Nicholes, "The Educational Development of Blacks in Cincinnati School District, 1800-Present" (Ed.D. dissertation, University of Cincinnati, 1971), p. 145.

[7] Anita Buck, "The Freedom Fighters," *Cincinnati*, July, 1983, p. 45.

[8] Interview with Charles Nuckolls, Cincinnati Public School Associate Director of Educational Opportunity Programs, Cincinnati, Ohio, May 3, 1983.

[9] "On Color Blindness," *The News-Record*, January 5, 1952, Editorial Page.

[10] "Langsam Fan of Football, etc.," *The Cincinnati Enquirer*, April 22, 1955.

[11] Interview with Gene Lewis, Professor of history, former U.C. Provost, Cincinnati, Ohio, May 17, 1983.

[12] *Ibid.*

[13] Meyer Weinberg, *A Chance to Learn: A History of Race and Education in the United States* (London: Cambridge University Press, 1977), p. 313.

[14] *Ibid.*, p. 287.

[15] Lewis, Interview, May 17, 1983.

[16] Interview with Mary T. Woelfel, Assistant Senior Vice President, Provost for Budgetary Affairs, Cincinnati, Ohio, August 8, 1983.

[17] Weinberg, *A Chance to Learn*, p. 307.

[18] "Students Picket Kresge," *News Record*, March, 1961.

[19] "Bigotry," *News Record*, Editorial, October 25, 1962.

[20] "U.C. segregation," *News Record*, April 14, 1963.

[21] *Ibid.*

[22] "Race Relations," *News Record*, October 10, 1965.

[23] "Negroes Walk Out on Racial Discussion," *News Record*, April 27, 1967.

[24] "U.C. Negro Students Meet, Unite," *News Record*, May 4, 1967.

[25] *Ibid.*

[26] Robert M. Folgelson and Robert Hill, "Who Riots?" A Study of Participation in the 1967 Riots," in *Supplemental Studies for the National Advisory Council for Civil Disorders* (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1968), p. 221.

[27] *Ibid.*

[28] "Riots," *Cincinnati Enquirer*, June 13, 1967.

[29] "Riots," *Cincinnati Enquirer*, April, 1968.

[30] "U.B.A. Submits Demand to Meet with Langsam," *News Record*, May 21, 1968.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] Allen B. Ballard, *The Education of Black Folk: The Afro-American Struggle for Knowledge in White America* (New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1973), p. 74.

[33] "U.C., The Community and Minorities: An Academic Report," University of Cincinnati Archives, 1968-69.

[34] "Langsam Responds," *News Record*, May 24, 1968.

[35] "Student Disorder Unfurls on Campus Administration, UBA Ponder University's Future," *News Record*, May 23, 1969.

[36] *Ibid*. UBA demanded that the University hire a black vice provost and black coach in the major sports.

[37] "Langsam Replies To The UBA Demands," *News Record*, May 28, 1969.

[38] Letter from Thomas Bonner, Vice Provost for Academic Affairs, to Students, Colleagues, University of Cincinnati Archives, May 23, 1969.

[39] *Ibid*.

[40] "Black Faculty Group Not Satisfied," *News Record*, May 28, 1969.

[41] *Ibid*.

[42] "Black Studies Program," *News Record*, April 28, 1970.

[43] Weinberg, *A Chance to Learn*, p. 331.

[44] "UBA Demands," *News Record*, May 23, 1969.

[45] Annual Report: Office of Vice Provost for Admissions and Records, University of Cincinnati, 1970.

[46] Lewis, Interview, May 17, 1983.

[47] Annual Report of Office of Vice Provost for Admissions and Records, University of Cincinnati, 1970.

[48] Summary Data, Office of Assistant Sr. Vice President, Provost for Budgetary Affairs, University of Cincinnati, 1969.

[49] "Temple," *News Record*, January 20, 1979.

[50] "Dr. Bennis Enthusiastic Over Idea of Heading U.C.," *Cincinnati Enquirer*, April 7, 1971.

[51] *Ibid*.

[52] "Warren Bennis Becomes President at U.C.," *News Record*, September 1971.

[53] "People Own the Presidency," *News Record*, December 3, 1971.

[54] *Ibid*.

[55] Interview with Dr. Vera Edwards, Emeritus Associate Professor, College of Education, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio, May 10, 1983.

[56] "Panel Reports U.C. Discrimination," *Cincinnati Enquirer*, December, 1972. No blacks were represented on 50 committees at the University.

[57] Annual Report, Office of the Vice Provost for Admissions and Records, University of Cincinnati, 1970.

[58] *Ibid.*

[59] Report, Enrollment by Race and Sex, Office of Student Records, University of Cincinnati, April 15, 1976.

[60] *Ibid.*

[61] "Advisory Group Studying Black Student Grievances," *News Record*, December 1, 1972.

[62] Letter, BALSA to Warren Bennis, May 3, 1973, University of Cincinnati, Archives and Special Collection.

[63] Statistical Data, Office of Assistant Sr. Vice President, Provost for Budgetary Affairs, University of Cincinnati, 1974.

[64] "HEW Finding," *News Record*, January 17, 1975.

[65] "Bennis Makes Two Major Appointments," *News Record*, January 28, 1972.

[66] "Johnson Named to Head Metro Affairs," *News Record*, May 23, 1972.

[67] John Anderson was appointed Dean of Student Development, Charles Johnson was Vice President for Metropolitan Affairs. Marguita McLean was Director, Office of University of Cincinnati on Human Resources. Geraldine Rickman was Bennis' special assistant and Director of Resource Development. See "Blacks in Bennis Administration," *News Record*, April 1, 1974.

[68] Interview with Thomas Wagner, Vice Provost for Faculty Affairs, former Special Assistant to Bennis, Cincinnati, Ohio, July 26, 1983.

[69] *Ibid.*

[70] "Johnson on Bennis' Lack of Support: Why Blacks Resign," *News Record*, October 4, 1974.

[71] "Temple Named Dean of University College," *News Record*, February 4, 1975.

[72] "White Male Club At U.C.," *News Record*, November 4, 1975.

[73] Interview With Herbert Shapiro, University of Cincinnati Professor of History, Cincinnati, Ohio, April 19, 1983.

[74] For more detail on the mission of the College of Community Services, see my article in the March, 1984 issue of *Innovative Higher Education*.

PART VI
Program and Proceedings

Midwest History of Education Society
1983 Annual Meeting

Hosted by School of Education, Loyola University, Water Tower Campus, Chicago, Illinois

October 28-29, 1983

Friday, October 28, 1983

9:30-10:30 a.m. First Session — Research in Progress
Fr. Michael Perko, Loyola University of Chicago
Chairperson

"In Harvard's Interest: The Influence of Charles W. Eliot and James B. Conant on Public Education"
Stephen Preskill, University of Illinois-Urbana

"The Part-Time School Movement as a Factor in the Formation of a National Vocational Education Act: 1900-1920"
Richard Lakes, University of Cincinnati

"Conceptions of Ninth-Grade Social Education, 1887-1916: From Ancient History to Community Civics"
Stuart McAninch, University of Illinois-Urbana

"The Detroit Industrial School Association"
Gary DeCoker, University of Michigan

"Mayor Cermak and the Chicago Schools"
Kip Sullivan, Loyola University of Chicago

10:45-12:15 Second Session — John Dewey Revised and Revisited
Joan K. Smith, Loyola University of Chicago
Chairperson
Regis Room 30

"John Dewey in the Evolution of Italian Education"
Charles R. Wold, Spencer Foundation, Chicago

"Frederick Eby and the Dewey Lectures: An Essentialist Present at Educational Progressivism's Conception"
Barry Westfall, Baylor University

"The Dewey School: A Record of Success and a Reality of Failure"
Christopher Eisele, Illinois State University

12:15-1:00 Registration, Regis Room 30

1:00-3:00 Third Session — Shaping Educational Policy: Models from the Past
David Adams, Cleveland State University
Chairperson

"Female Sexuality as a Barrier to the Rise of Women Schoolteachers: 1890-1910"
Patricia Carter, University of Cincinnati

"Education as a Form of Emergency Relief: The New Deal Experience"
Judith Sealander, Wright State University

"Beyond the Prosser Resolution: Another Look at Life Adjustment Education"
Richard Ognibene, The College of Saint Rose, Albany

"The Twilight of Public Alternative Education: Professional Malignancy, an Historical Perspective"
James T. Sears, Trinity University

3:00-4:00 Fourth Session — A Past Perspective on Childhood Theory and Practice
Gerald Gutek, Loyola University of Chicago
Chairperson
Room 30

"Ontario's Kindergarten-Primary Movement: Utilitarianism Subverts Idealism"
Anne Wood, Dalhousie University

"The Farm School System of 19th Century Europe and Its Legacy"
Trevor J. Phillips, Bowling Green State University

4:00-5:00 Fifth Session — Panel
Pedagogical Theorists and Educational Outcomes
Sam R. Snyder, University of Toledo
Chairperson
Room 30

"The Institutio Oratoria: Quintilian's Contribution to Educational Theory and Practice"
Timothy Reagan, Visiting Assistant Professor, University of Illinois-Urbana

"Giambattista Vico: An Educator for Today"
Robert P. Craig, St. Mary's College, Orchard Lake, Michigan

186

"De LaSalle and Primary Teacher Education in 17th Century France"
Br. Dominic Everett, Loyola University of Chicago

5:00-6:00 p.m. Business Meeting
President's Room

6:00-7:00 p.m. Social Hour
President's Room

Saturday, October 29, 1983

9:00-10:00 a.m. Sixth Session — Issues in Historical Research
L. Glenn Smith, Iowa State University
Chairperson

"Historical Research for Education Questions"
Joan Lakebrink, DePaul University

"Oral History: Use of Interviews for a Historical Perspective of Early Childhood Education"
Sherry L. Boyd, University of Dubuque

10:00-12:00 Seventh Session — Some Perspectives on Higher Education
Wilma Miranda, Northern Illinois University
Chairperson

"The Americanization of Higher Learning"
Egal Feldman, University of Wisconsin

"The Life and Death of an Agricultural College"
William Eaton, Southern Illinois University

"From Principal Teacher to Corporate Manager: An Institutional Case History of Change in the Role of the College President"
Robert N. Barger, Eastern Illinois University

"Privileged Turf: Black Participation at the University of Cincinnati: 1950-1970"
Lewis L. Jones, University of Cincinnati

Noon Adjournment

Minutes: 1983 Annual Business Meeting
The Midwest History of Education Society
Loyola University of Chicago
Friday, October 28, 1983

The annual business meeting of the Midwest History of Education Society convened at 5:10 p.m., (Friday) October 28, 1983 in Room Thirty at Loyola University of Chicago. The meeting was called to order by Society President David L. Angus.

The reading of the minutes of the 1982 business meeting was dispensed with and the minutes, as published in Volume 11 of the *Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society*, were approved.

Edward Rutkowski reviewed the financial status of the journal. It continues to be healthy, with an additional five institutional subscriptions purchased in the last year. Presently, the journal has a balance of $843.14 in its account.

The following slate of officers for 1984 was nominated, seconded, and elected by acclamation:

President:	Joan K. Smith Loyola University of Chicago
Vice President:	F. Michael Perko, S.J. Loyola University of Chicago
Secretary:	Christopher Eisele Illinois State University

Vice President and Program Chair Joan Smith reported on this year's program. Twenty-eight proposals were received, of which fifteen were accepted for paper sessions and another eight as components of two panels. In reply to a question, Edward Rutkowski stated that there was no plan to put the panel presentations in the journal; however, he felt it would be possible to publish abstracts of these presentations. It was pointed out that both submissions and attendance for this year represent a marked increase over the last several years.

Michael Perko reported on the status of the invitation from the History of Education Society to meet jointly in Chicago in 1984. At its 1983 annual meeting in Vancouver, the History of Education Society unanimously accepted the invitation from the Midwest History of Education Society for a joint meeting. Prof. Jennings L. Wagoner will chair the History of Education's program committee, and has indicated a strong desire to give the meeting a strong midwestern tone. He has suggested that one way of accomplishing this would be to involve a majority of Midwest History of Education Society members on the national program

200

committee. Presently, feeling is favoring an integrated program rather than a combination of separate and combined sessions between the two organizations. The question was raised as to the way in which the different character of the meeting will affect the publication of papers in the *Journal of the Midwest History of Education Society*. Not all papers will be published. Present plans are to ask authors at the time of proposal submission to indicate whether they wish the papers to be considered for publication in the journal. Those who elect to have their papers considered will submit them to a jury of MHES members, and the accepted papers will be published.

A question was raised as to the requirement of midwestern residence for membership in the Society. The sense of the group was that our organization's history was one of encouraging membership across geographical boundaries and so, neither midwestern residence nor research on midwestern topics are necessary for membership.

On behalf of the members, President Angus expressed appreciation to Loyola University, and especially to Dean Gutek, Assistant Dean Kay Smith, and the graduate students, for hosting the 1983 meeting. The 1984 meeting will be, in all probability, a hotel meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 5:45 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

F. Michael Perko, S.J.
Secretary

David Adams
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, OH 44115

David L. Angus
University of Michigan
School of Education
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Jo Barger
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, IL 61920

Robert Barger
Eastern Illinois University
Charleston, IL 61920

Warren Benson
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
2065 Half Day Rd.
Deerfield, IL 60015

Patti Cale
Iowa State University
N151 Quad
Ames, Iowa 50011

Patricia Carter
University of Cincinnati
Women's Research Institute
ML #164
Cincinnati, OH 43221

Stephen M. Colby
5737 S. Kimbark Ave.
Chicago, IL 60637

Bob Craig
St. Mary's
6320 N. Kenmore

Harriet Custer
Iowa State University
1108 Norton Ave.
Des Moines, Iowa 50316

Loretta Davenport
Iowa State University
111-H University Village
Ames, Iowa 50011

Gary DeCoker
University of Michigan
1607 S. University
Ann Arbor, MI 48104

Walter H. Drost
300 N. 50th St.
Milwaukee, WI 53208

William Eaton
Southern Illinois Univ.
at Carbondale
Carbondale, IL 62901

Chris Eisele
Illinois State University
336 DeGarmo Hall
Normal, IL 61761

Br. Dominic Everett, FSC
Loyola University of Chicago
200 DeLaSalle Drive
Romeoville, IL 60441

William O. Farley
Northern Michigan University
Marquette, MI 49855

Egal Feldman
University of Wisconsin-
Superior
Department of History
Superior, WI 54880

Gerald L. Gutek
Loyola University of Chicago
School of Education
Chicago, IL 60611

A. Hugh Jones
Ball State University
808 TL, BSN
Muncie, IN 47304

Lewis L. Jones
University of Cincinnati
College of Education
Cincinnati, OH 45221

John W. Keienburg
Valparaiso University
Miller Hall
Valparaiso, IN 46383

Joan M. Lakebrink
DePaul University
Chicago, IL

Rick Lakes
Ohio State University
NCRVE
1960 Kenny Rd.
Columbus, OH 43210

Robert M. Lang
Northern Illinois University
DeKalb, IL 60115

Paul Magnus
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
2065 Half Day Rd.
Deerfield, IL 60015

Russell Marks
910 Diamond Lake Rd., #10
Mundelein, IL 60060

Dan Marshall
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, TX 78712

Robert E. Mason
390 Lake St.
Huntington, IN 46750

Stuart McAninch
University of Illinois at Urbana
360 Education Building
Urbana, IL 61801

Robert L. McCaul
5835 S. Kimbark Ave.
Chicago, IL 60637

Ed McClellan
Indiana University
School of Education
Bloomington, IN 47405

Wilma Miranda
Northern Illinois University
301 Pond St.
DeKalb, IL 60178

Jeff Mirel
University of Michigan
4002 School of Education Bldg.
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Gary Newton
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
2065 Half Day Rd.
Deerfield, IL 60015

Richard Ognibene
The College of St. Rose
432 Western Ave.
Albany, NY 12203

Michael Otanga
Trinity Evangelical Divinity
School
2065 Half Day Rd.
Deerfield, IL 60015

Eben O. Palmquist
55731 Ridgeview Lane
Naperville, IL 60540

Jane Parker
Loyola University of Chicago
707 Clinton Place R.F.
Chicago, IL 60611

F. Michael Perko, S.J.
Loyola University of Chicago
820 N. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, IL 60611

Trevor J. Phillips
Bowling Green State University
Bowling Green, OH 43403

Steve Preskill
University of Illinois at Urbana
360 Education Building
Urbana, IL 61801

Timothy Reagan
1310 S. Sixth St.
Champaign, IL 61820

David Ripley
Northern Illinois University
LEPS Dept., N 14
GH 427
DeKalb, IL 60178

Peter Ruta
Loyola University of Chicago
1709 W. Lunt Ave.
Chicago, IL 60611

Edward Rutkowski
University of Northern Iowa
513 Ed. Center
Cedar Falls, Iowa 50614

Charles E. Samec
614 S. Clarence Ave.
Oak Park, IL 60304

Judith Sealander
Wright State University
History Department
Dayton, OH 45435

Mark Senter
Loyola University of Chicago
295 Arapahoe
Chicago, IL 60611

Joan K. Smith
Loyola University of Chicago
820 N. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, IL 60611

Kay Smith
Loyola University of Chicago
820 N. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, IL 60611

L. Glenn Smith
Iowa State University
N 155 Quad
Ames, Iowa 50011

Sam R. Snyder
University of Toledo
Toledo, OH 43606

Greg Sprague
Loyola University of Chicago
1437 Lunt; 1-N
Chicago, IL 60626

Kip Sullivan
Loyola University of Chicago
255 Comet Drive
Braidwood, IL 60408

Joyce L. Thornton
Trinity Evangelical Divinity School
2065 Half Day Rd.
Deerfield, IL 60015

Barry Westfall
Baylor University
School of Education
Waco, TX 76710

Charles R. Wolf
Loyola University of Chicago
3343 W. Warner
Chicago, IL 60618

Anne Wood
Dalhousie University
5959 Spring Garden Rd., #507
Halifax, N.S.

John M. Wozniak
Loyola University of Chicago
820 N. Michigan Ave.
Chicago, IL 60611